DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 994 CE 036 427

AUTHOR	Sum, Andrew M.; Harrington, Paul E.
TITLE	Occupational Information Needs for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking, Planning, and Program Operations.
INSTITUTION	Research Triangle Inst., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (DOL/ETA), Washington, DC.; North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, Raleigh.
PUB DATE	Mar 81
NOTE	381p.; For related documents, see CE 036 422-432.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC16 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Vocational Education; Career Education; Employment Opportunities; Employment Programs; Employment Projections; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; *Information Needs; Information Sources; Information Utilization; Job Training; Labor Force; *Labor Needs; *Occupational Information; *Policy Formation; Program Administration; Program Design; *Program Development; Program Evaluation; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Prime Sponsors

ABSTRACT

This report on labor force and occupational information needs of Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) prime sponsors begins with a description of the CETA legislation and programs. The role and use of this information in CETA policy-making and program planning is addressed. Chapter 2 reviews the prime sponsor planning process for CETA programs, the planning process for CETA Title I and II programs under the 1973 legislation, the major changes in the planning process brought about by the 1978 amendments, and the roles of advisory councils and the Employment and Training Administration. Chapter 3 describes informational requirements for targeting CETA resources, designing the employment and training services mix, selecting occupational areas for training, designing a training program curriculum, developing unsubsidized jobs for program trainees, and evaluating short- and long-term program performance. Desirable characteristics of industrial and occupational data are reviewed. Chapter 4 reviews and critically examines the available data sources. Information is provided on the geographic coverage, frequency of availability, primary characteristics of the information, and major shortcomings. Chapter 5 presents recommendations for improving the availability and usefulness of the local labor force and occupational information. (A 27-page bibliography is appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231994

OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION NEEDS FOR CETA PRIME SPONSOR POLICYMAKING, PLANNING, AND PROGRAM OPERATIONS

by

Andrew M. Sum
Paul E. Harrington

Prepared for

North Carolina State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee

and

National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee

Research Triangle Institute
North Carolina

March 1981

CE036427

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ABOUT NOICC

The National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) and its counterpart State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees (SOICCs) were created by the Education Amendments of 1976 (Public Law 94-482) with a mandate to:

- Development and implement a national, State and local occupational information system to meet the common occupational information needs of vocational education and employment and training program adminstrators and planners, and
- Improve coordination between, and communication among, such administrators and planners, as well as employment security agency administrators, research personnel and others.

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) Amendments of 1978 (Public Law 95-524) call for NOICC to:

- give special attention to the labor market information needs of youth.

The following officials are named in the 1976 law as members of NOICC:

- Commissioner of Education[1],
- Administrator of the National Center for Education Statistics,
- Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, and
- Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

The members of each SOICC, also specified in the law, are representatives of:

- the State Board administering vocational education,
- the State employment security agency,
- the State employment and training council, and
- the State agency administering the vocational rehabilitation program.

[1] The function of the U.S. Offrice of Education was moved to the U.S. Department of Education subsequent to the 1976 law.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is one of several products of the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) produced under a grant for "Assistance in Occupational Information System Development and Implementation." This grant was awarded in 1979 to a consortium of the State occupational information coordinating committees (SOICCs) of North Carolina, South Carolina and Colorado.

The grant called for the accomplishment of four major tasks:

> Task 1. Preparation of a national overview of the need for occupational information through a review of the literature, a summary of State needs assessment studies, interviews with Federal agency staff, and preparation of concept papers by recognized experts in the fields of vocational education, career counselling, CETA program planning, employment service operations and vocational rehabilitation. Reports from Task 1, including this report, are listed on p. iii.
>
> Task 2. Development of an Occupational Information System (OIS) Handbook. This task has resulted in a three volume Handbook:
>
> Volume 1. Occupational Information Development
>
> Volume 2. Occupational Information Analysis, Presentation and Delivery
>
> Volume 3. Technical Addendum
>
> An OIS Handbook Executive Summary has been prepared as well.
>
> Task 3. Development of training materials to accompany the OIS Handbook. The training materials include over 100 pieces of art work suitable for making overhead slides and a trainer's guide designed for use by Federal and State personnel to introduce audiences to the NOICC/SOICC network and the occupational information system.

Task 4. A training conference to introduce the OIS Handbook. Such a conference for States and territories in Federal regions 1-5 was held January 6-9, 1981, in Raleigh, North Carolina, and for those in Regions 6-10, January 27-30, 1981, in San Antonio, Texas. Participants in the conferences included representatives of the Federal and State agencies which are members of NOICC and SOICCs, and staff of the SOICCs.

Task 1 was carried out by Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. Dr. John E.S. Lawrence and Dr. Alvin M. Cruze served as project managers and authored some of the reports. Tasks 2 and 3 were performed by Program Resources, Incorporated, of Rockville, Maryland. David S. Lipstein, PRI Vice President, served as project director; Harvey Ollis was principal investigator. Task 4 was carried out jointly by RTI and PRI.

Joyce F. Kinnison, Director of the North Carolina SOICC, and Geroge E. Probst, Director of Research for the North Carolina SOICC, served as overall managers of the grant. Carol Kososki, Director of the South Carolina SOICC, and Warren W. Wolff, Director of the Colorado SOICC, provided valuable input and served as reviewers for the project.

Dixie Sommers of the NOICC staff was responsible for monitoring and overseeing the grant, under the supervision of Richard E. Dempsey. Russell B. Flanders, Executive Director of NOICC, provided general direction.

This report, one of the products of Task 1, discussed the use of occupational information in CETA prime sponsor policy making, planning and program operations. It was prepared by Andrew M. Sum and Paul E. Harrington, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent policy of NOICC or its member agencies.

Reports on the Need for Occupational Information

Concepts Papers

Occupational Information System and the Employment Security System: A Need and Resources Assessment, Charles E. O'Dell, 1980.

Occupational Information and Vocational Education: A Concept Paper, Donald W. Drewes and Gary R. Bice, 1980.

The Role of an Occupational Informatin System in Career Guidance and Counselling, Edwin L. Herr, 1980.

Occupational Information Needs for CETA Prime Sponsor Policy Making, Planning, and Program Operations, Andrew M. Sum and Paul E. Harrington, 1980.

Occupational Information System and Vocational Rehabilitation: A Concept Paper, Joseph B. Moriarty, 1981.

Literature Review

Data needs and uses of the Context of an Occupational Information System: A Review of the Literature, Nancy Paulson, 1980.

State Needs Assessment

Occupational Information Needs at the State Level: An Empirical Study of Data Needs Assessment Surveys, John E.S Lawrence and John Gross, 1980.

Federal Interviews

Occupational Information Needs at the Federal Level, John E.S. Lawrence and Alvin M. Cruze, 1981.

Final Report

Occupational Information Needs in Selected Public Agencies at the State and National Levels, John E.S. Lawrence, 1981.

Copies of Reports are available from NOICC
2100 M Street, N.W., Suite 714, Washington, D.C. 20037

AUTHORS' ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In preparing this report for the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, the authors benefited from the information, advice, and support provided by numerous individuals. While not representative of all the individuals who contributed in one way or another to the final product, the following individuals are deserving of particular thanks and recognition.

First, the project manager for this study was John Lawrence of the Research Triangle Institute. John is particularly deserving of our thanks for the cooperation and encouragement he provided to us throughout the entire project and for his tireless patience and good humor in waiting for the final chapters. We sincerely hope that the quality of our final product justifies the additional months of time and effort that were invested in the project. Second, Daryl Delano of the Region I Bureau of Labor Statistics was extraordinarily cooperative in providing us with current information on the whole range of BLS-SESA programs and with sharing his insights on desirable future directions for state occupational information systems.

Third, numerous conversations were held with individuals involved in the production, coordination, and use of labor market information, occupational information, and program evaluation data. These conversations were designed to obtain their views on the usefulness of existing data and their recommendations for improving the quality and usefulness of existing data products. These individuals included the following: Russ Ganz, Edward Meehan, and Irwin Herrnstadt of the Center for Labor Market Studies of Northeastern University; Robert Vinson, Glen Schneider, and Jeffrey Zornitsky of the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development; William Harkins and Robert D'Allesandro of the Region I Employment and Training Administration; Paul Vigeant of the Fall River, Massachusetts Prime Sponsor; John Dorrer, Robert Sherlock, and Dan Littman of the Penobscot, Maine Consortium Employment and Training Administration; Betsy Muntzer and Eliot Winer of the Massachusetts Job Market Research section of the Division of Employment Security; Ray Fongemie of the Maine Department of Manpower Affairs, Manpower Research Division; Stu Tischler of the Massachusetts State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee; Jeremy Ingpen of the New England Board of Higher Education; and Dick Dempsey and Jim

Woods of the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee. The views presented in this report are, however, those of the authors alone. Fourth, thanks are due to Professor Irwin Herrnstadt of Northeastern University's Department of Economics for his careful review of the document and his willingness to draft the foreword to this volume and to Professor Morris Horowitz, Chairman of the Department of Economics, for his support of the Center's activities in the area of labor market information during the past two years.

Fifth, personal thanks are owed to Russell B. Flanders, Executive Director of the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, for the many years of encouragement and personal support that he has provided to Andrew Sum and for his devotion to the establishment of effective comprehensive occupational information systems for use at the national and state level.

Finally, personal recognition is owed to Paul Simpson, a research assistant in the Center for Labor Market Studies, for his help in developing and maintaining the bibliography contained in the report and to Mary McCarthy and Sheila Palma for their assistance in typing and retyping the numerous drafts of this report. Ms. McCarthy is also owed our deep gratitude and thanks for her effective organization and management of all of the activities that made the publication of this final report possible.

Andrew M. Sum
Paul E. Harrington

Center for Labor Market Studies
Northeastern University

FOREWORD

The need for this particular study is not hard to find. As Sum and Harrington point out in Chapter 1, successive pieces of education, and employment and training legislation have included more and more planning requirements. In Chapter 2, the authors explain how the CETA planning process and its associated planning documents depend upon local labor force and labor market data, if only to follow the letter of the law. The authors, however, expect local employment and training administrators and local educators to act more responsibly than that. They want them to engage in a rational decisionmaking process that seeks the most appropriate kinds of programs for those who most need them to escape impoverishment and economic dependency.

Rational employment and training program planning, however, requires the ability to identify those eligible for and most in need of services, to diagnose rigorously the reasons for their labor market difficulties, and to select the proper strategies to achieve local goals and objectives. In this way, limited employment and training resources can be used in the most effective manner. This, however, requires as a first step some fundamental information about the residents of a prime sponsor's planning area, its employment opportunities, and its educational and training resources.

Unfortunately, this first step is more like an architect's sketch than a completed building. The current bleak picture presented by Sum and Harrington is partially understandable. Few if any of our local labor force and labor market data series were developed with the local planning of education and training programs in mind, nor were they designed to be key components of an integrated, consistent data system. Still, the need for data for local planning is not exactly new. It dates back at least to the early 1960s, if not earlier, if we acknowledge the fact that public vocational education existed long before ARA or MDTA.

This study has two premises. The first, suggested above, is that CETA prime sponsor planners must have proper data with which to plan so that their efforts can be converted from a sterile "compliance exercise" into a purposive set of activities to identify and deal with local employment and income problems. The latter rather than the former presumably was the Congressional intent in passing such legislation as the 1978 CETA reauthorization and the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments. As Sum and Harrington note, Congress unfortunately has legislated planning requirements without much awareness of critical data gaps.

The second premise is that the prime sponsor will take planning seriously if those who review their planning efforts take it seriously as well. Fulfilling both premises entails costs. Similar premises apply to local educators if they are to offer vocational education courses that simultaneously satisfy student and employer interests.

The authors pinpoint the data gaps that currently prevent serious planning and show how they can be filled realistically, in many cases by improving existing systems of labor force and labor market data of the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), and State Employment Security Agencies (SESA's). In addition to the shortcomings of existing data systems, there are needs for which data systems have yet to be devised. Sum and Harrington are not afraid to recommend such new data ventures. Whether you agree or not with the authors' criticisms and their recommendations, they are based upon detailed analyses of the strengths and weaknesses of each data system with respect to the needs of local planners, and give the reader a valuable guided tour of the data presently available.

All current data series can be faulted for possessing at least one of three basic deficiencies and most for at least two. The three are lack of timeliness, that is not providing current information (a problem true even of the Census data after a few years); unreliable or inaccurate information, either because of samples that are too small or that are improperly designed; and, finally, mismatches between the geographic coverage of the data and the geographic boundaries of the planning area. Needless to say, the last two problems are not independent of each other since samples that are large enough for reliable national statistics are usually too small for state and substate purposes. Patchwork attempts to compensate for such problems; such as using statistics collected for administrative purposes, do not seem to have done a creditable job. Sum and Harrington's approach is first to specify an ideal data system for local CETA planning, describing in detail the kinds of information that existing data systems, suitably augmented, should provide

(Chapter 3) and then to critically scrutinize the current data bases in terms of this standard (Chapter 4). They conclude (Chapter 5) with a series of recommendations, based on this analysis, many of which can be met promptly at minimal cost. The emphasis is on local planning needs and creating an integrated, coordinated, truly comprehensive system for this purpose. The National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) and the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees (SOICC's) would have important roles in this endeavor, including that of opening up channels of communication between those who produce and those who use the data, facilitating the better dissemination and use of existing data (including overcoming stringent confidentiality restrictions that prevent the release of information), and spearheading and helping to guide the design and implementation of local employer surveys. The purpose of such guidance is to avoid duplication of effort and to ensure adherence to standards necessary for production of valid, useful information.

The data sources that Sum and Harrington would have us improve or better exploit, even if left unmodified, are the 1980 Census (particularly information from its "long form"); the Current Population Survey's (CPS) Household Sample once it is expanded along the lines recommended by the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics; the Bureau of Labor Statistics' (BLS) industry employment figures (Current Employment Survey of "790" series), its occupational staffing patterns (Occcupational Employment Survey), and its occupational/industry projections (State and Area Projections Program, SAPP); the SESA's covered industry employment statistics (the ES-202 series), its Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed (ES-203 series), and its Characteristics of Job Service Applicants (taken from ESARS, the Employment Service's Automated Reporting System).

Sum and Harrington also urge the Employment and Training Administration to sponsor in 1982 or 1983 a special non-recurring sample household survey similar in scope to the 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE) conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the former Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). Such a survey would be designed to provide local planners with reliable information about the numbers and characteristics of the economically disadvantaged and the CETA-eligible residents of their planning areas. They also propose that the pilot job vacancy statistics program, now on a temporary basis in a few states, become a permanent part of the nation's labor market information system.

Of all the key data sources, the most readily useful will be the 1980 Census, the CPS household survey, and, if confidentiality obstacles can be overcome, the ES-202. Only the CPS household survey needs major revision, not in its fundamental design but in sample size. The CPS is particularly valuable since it provides public use tapes based on micro-data which planners can use for their own special analysis.

Nonetheless, the 1980 Census will soon become somewhat dated for planning purposes. Sum and Harrington appear to have little confidence in the updating methodology of the Labor Market Projections Model of ETA. They suggest, however, that the incorporation of more local area data from the expanded CPS might succeed in improving matters. The special sample household survey recommended by Sum and Harrington is to fill the void between Censuses. The authors would like to rely upon the expanded CPS household survey, but cannot do so before at least 1985 since it will take several years to accumulate enough data for detailed area usage.

One is left with the conclusion that some of the weakest series are the BLS ones that deal with the demand side of local labor markets (its 790 establishment survey, SAPP occupation-industry projections, and the LTS turnover and accessions series). All suffer from serious limitations on industry and geographic coverage and sample imperfections. In addition, SAPP currently makes only longrun projections. Sum and Harrington feel that periodic revisions of the projections every two to three years would likely improve their reliability and restore user confidence.

The most valuable of the BLS series could be that of the OES staffing patterns program if it ever controls the rather extreme intra-industry, inter-employer variability in estimates and stops revising its occupational codes. Diagnosing the major cause of this variation to be the excessively narrow occupational classifications, Sum and Harrington urge adoption of the newly-designed Standard Occupational Classification system (SOC) as the solution for both problems. Adoption of the SOC would also ensure comparability with other data systems.

Among the study's important, but mostly untried proposals, are a new series reporting on the occupations of new hires, and under the auspices of Private Industry Councils (PICs), special local studies to identify primary employers, at whom to direct job development and placement efforts, and to ascertain the structure of their internal labor markets, and their "port-of-entry" jobs. Sum and Harrington see such local employer surveys making a unique contribution, if properly directed, including the collection of information about hiring policies and training paths, that is the specific kind of occupational preparation employers seek in new hires, such as having attended a particular vocational education program or having a certain number of years of experience of a particular sort. This survey would enable prime sponsors to assess the "demonstrated effectiveness" of training agencies and other institutions, as well as help them and vocational educators to meet employer educational and training requirements, especially with respect to skilled occupations in short supply.

The list of new programs also includes a comprehensive inventory of local occupational training programs of a formal nature (which the SOICC's would assemble). The training inventory would cover all public and private non-CETA programs, including apprenticeship at the secondary and postsecondary levels up to two-year associate degrees programs in higher education. This information would help prime sponsors identify competing sources of supply and choose contractors for the delivery of educational and training services.

Program evaluation is also an integral part of the Sum and Harrington repast. They urge ETA to require annual prime sponsor reports of the weekly earnings and occupations of unsubsidized jobs obtained by former enrollees and to conduct detailed analyses on a continuing basis of the findings of the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS). One of the primary objectives is to determine the relative impact of the duration and occupational area of training on the postprogram earnings and employability of former trainees as a means of allocating future training funds. If Sum and Harrington had their way, they would have all prime sponsors achieve a minimumly acceptable follow-up capability for evaluation purposes by FY '81.

Some of Sum and Harrington's recommendations are more urgent than others, but can be met without drastic changes in existing programs. Others represent new modes of thinking for the E&T community, and depend on relatively untried organizations (such as the SOICC's). All should, however, contribute to more rational and effective decisionmaking by prime sponsors and vocational educators who are now required to participate in local E&T planning. The successful implementation of the authors' recommendations provide rather exciting challenges to the entire labor market data producing community at the Federal and state level as well as to the CETA prime sponsor and SOICC system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements i

Foreword vi

List of Tables xvii

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF CETA PRIME SPONSOR OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION NEEDS 1

Initial Passage of CETA 1

Developments in the CETA System Since 1974 3

Public Service Employment Programs 4

Recent Trends in CETA Youth Employment and Training Programs . 7

The 1978 CETA Amendments and Their Influence Upon the Structure and Goals of CETA Programs 8

The Role and Use of Labor Market and Occupational Information in CETA Policymaking and Program Planning 11

Outline of Remaining Chapters 14

Footnotes 16

CHAPTER 2. THE NATURE OF THE CETA PRIME SPONSOR PLANNING PROCESS 31

CETA Prime Sponsors 31

The Planning of CETA Title I and II Programs Under the 1973 CETA Act 32

The Role of Prime Sponsor Planning Councils, State Manpower Services Councils, and the Regional ETA Offices in Reviewing and Approving Prime Sponsor Plans 36

The CETA Prime Sponsor Planning Process Under the 1978 CETA Amendments 38

Measuring Prime Sponsor Program Performance; Prime Sponsor Evaluation Efforts 44

The Planning Roles and Responsibilities of Prime Sponsor Planning Councils; the Roles of the State Employment and Training Councils and the Regional Offices of ETA 45

The Private Industry Council 46

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

CHAPTER 2. (continued)

State Employment and Training Councils 49

The Plan Review and Approval Roles of the Regional Offices of ETA. 50

Footnotes. 52

CHAPTER 3. THE LABOR FORCE AND OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION NEEDS OF CETA PRIME SPONSORS FOR LOCAL POLICYMAKING AND PROGRAM PLANNING . . 65

Introduction 65

Labor Force Information Needs. 66

Earnings and Income Data 74

Data on the Economically Disadvantaged 75

Industrial Employment and Occupational Information Needs of CETA Prime Sponsors. 77

Industry Employment Data 77

Occupational Staffing Pattern Data 84

Data on Accessions and Labor Turnover. 85

Job Vacancy Data 86

Projections of Industry and Occupational Employment for States and Local Labor Areas. 87

Wages and Hours. 88

Information on the Structure of the Internal Labor Markets of Local Firms. 89

Hiring Policies and Hiring Patterns of Local Firms 90

Occupational Supply Information for CETA Planning Purposes . . 91

Occupational Characteristics of the Unemployed 92

Occupational Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed 95

Occupational Characteristics of Active Job Service Applicants. 96

Information on Institutional-Based Training System 96

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

CHAPTER 3. (continued)

Occupational Outputs of the CETA Employment and Training System. 99

Footnotes 102

CHAPTER 4. AVAILABLE DATA SOURCES ON LABOR FORCE AND OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION FOR LOCAL CETA POLICYMAKING AND PROGRAM PLANNING. 118

Introduction. 118

Population Data 119

Labor Force Data. 132

Employment Data 134

Unemployment Data 135

Annual Earnings and Incomes Data. 139

The Continuous Work-History Sample (CWHS) 143

The Economically Disadvantaged. 145

Available Data Scurces on Industry Employment, Occupational Employment, and Occupational Characteristics. 149

Industry Employment Data. 149

Existing Sources of Data on Occupational Staffing Patterns by Industry. 160

Census-Based Staffing Patterns Data 160

OES Survey-Based Data 162

Major Limitations of the OES Survey 163

Sources of Data on Labor Turnover and Accessions. 165

The BLS Labor Turnover Survey 166

The Employment Service Potential Project. 167

Sources of Data on the Numbers and Occupational Characteristics of Job Openings 169

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

CHAPTER 4. (continued)

Sources of Data on Projections of Employment by Industry and Occupation at the State and Substate Level. 172

Limitations of the State and Area Projections 174

Sources of Data on Wages and Hours of Work by Occupation. . . 176

Sources of Information on the Structure of Internal Labor Markets of Local Firms. 178

Sources of Information on Hiring Practices and Policies of Local Firms 180

Sources of Occupational Supply Data for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning 181

Occupational Characteristics of Unemployed Job Seekers. . . . 181

Data and Information Sources on Non-CETA Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs 186

Information on the Occupational Outputs of Local CETA Employment and Training Programs. 194

Footnotes 200

CHAPTER 5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE LABOR FORCE AND OCCUPATIONAL INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO LOCAL CETA PRIME SPONSORS FOR POLICY-MAKING AND PROGRAM PLANNING PURPOSES. 240

Introduction. 240

Recommendations for Improving Information on the Population, Labor Force, Incomes and Earnings, and the Economically Disadvantaged in CETA Prime Sponsor Areas. 253

Local Population. 253

Local Labor Force Data. 254

Employment and Unemployment 255

Local Employment Data 255

Local Unemployment Data 257

Earnings and Income Data. 258

Page

CHAPTER 5. (continued)

Data on the Numbers and Characteristics of the Local Economically Disadvantaged Population 259

Recommendations for Improving Data on Local Industrial and Occupational Employment and Information on Occupational Characteristics for CETA Policymaking and Program Planning . . 261

Industry Employment Data 261

Job Development Guides 262

Occupational Staffing Pattern Data 263

Short-term Improvements 263

Longer-term Recommendations 264

Labor Turnover and Accessions Data 268

Job Vacancy Data 270

Projections of Employment by Industry and Occupation at the State and Substate Level 271

Recommendations Relating to Data on Wages and Hours of Work by Occupation; the Structure of Local Firms' Internal Labor Markets; and Local Establishment Hiring Policies and Patterns. 273

The Occupational Characteristics of the Unemployed 275

Information on Occupationally-Oriented Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs 276

Occupational Outputs and Employment and Earnings Impacts of CETA Programs 279

Recommendations for Improving the Use of Labor Market and Occupational Information by CETA Prime Sponsors 281

Footnotes 285

BIBLIOGRAPHY 294

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
3-1	Population, Labor Force, Employment, Unemployment, and Income Data Needs of CETA Prime Sponsors for Policymaking and Program Planning	67
3-2	Industry Employment and Occupational Information Needs for CETA Prime Sponsors for Policymaking and Program Planning	78
3-3A	Occupational Characteristics of the Unemployed	93
3-3B	Information on Non-CETA Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs for CETA Prime Sponsor Program Planning	97
3-4	Immediate and Longer-Term Occupational Outputs of CETA Prime Sponsors' Employment and Training Programs	100
4-1	Population, Labor Force, Income and Earnings Data Available for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning	120
4-1A	Estimates of the Total Number of Unemployed and the Number of Insured Unemployed Under State U.I. Programs, by State: 1978	140
4-2	Available Industry Employment Data and Occupational Information for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning	150
4-3A	Available Data Sources on the Occupational Characteristics of the Unemployed in State and Local Labor Areas and Prime Sponsor Planning Areas	182
4-3A2	Estimates of the Civilian Labor Force and the Number of New and Renewed Applicants in ES Offices, by State: 1978	187
4-3B	Data and Information Sources on Non-CETA Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs	190
4-4	Available Data Sources on the Outputs of CETA Employment and Training Programs	195
5-1	Recommendations for Improving Population, Labor Force, Earnings and Incomes Information for Local CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning	241
5-2	Recommendations for Improving Information on Local Industrial and Occupational Employment Developments and Occupational Characteristics for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning	245
5-3A	Recommendations for Improving Information on Unemployment Developments Within Occupations	248

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Number Page

5-3B Recommendations for Improving Information on Occupational Supply in Local Labor Areas. 249

5-4 Recommendations for Improving Existing Information on the Outcomes and Occupational Outputs of CETA Employment and Training Programs 251

Chapter 1

Introduction to the Study of CETA Prime Sponsor Occupational Information Needs

Initial Passage of CETA

In December of 1973, Congress passed and the President signed into law Public Law 93-203: The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 (hereafter referred to as CETA).[1] The enactment of this particular piece of legislation essentially completed the process of decentralizing responsibility for planning, designing, and operating the set of federally-funded categorical employment and training programs that had been built up throughout the nation since the early 1960's.[2] These previous categorical employment and training programs included such diverse programs as the institutional and OJT training programs funded under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (MDTA); the work experience and job training programs for the urban and rural poor, funded under the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP); the OJT programs for the economically disadvantaged funded under NAB-JOBS; the work experience programs for youth under the Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs (NYC); and the public service job programs funded under the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 (EEA).[3] In Fiscal Year 1974, the year prior to the onset of CETA program operations, Federal obligations for the U.S. Department of Labor's categorical employment and training programs (exclusive of the Job Corps and the Work Incentive Program) were $1.744 billion, and first-time enrollments in these programs were 1,519,000.[4]

The basic rationale for decategorizing and decentralizing the planning and administration of the above employment and training programs was that the problems of the unemployed and the poor differed from one locality to another and that the specific types of employment and training strategies needed to successfully combat these problems were, thus, also likely to differ among communities. Given these variations among local communities in the types of labor market problems encountered by their residents and in the overall health and structure of their local economies, basic decisions as to who should be served by the employment and training system and how they should be served were best made by local government agencies and chief elected officials. The case for decentralizing the decisionmaking process for employment and training programs was spelled out rather eloquently in the President's 1971 Manpower Message to the Congress. In that message, the President remarked that:

> Designing a manpower program that can best deliver its intended services starts with the recognition, one, that the 'job market' is really thousands of interacting but separate markets spread all over the economic and geographic map of the United States... Under the circumstances it makes little sense for Washington to dominate decisions on manpower assistance - not when 50 states and thousands of local government units, each in touch with its own territory and close to its own peoples stand ready to apply their know-how if Washington will only pay the bills. 5

The 1973 CETA Act attempted to achieve a decentralized delivery system by providing funding for the planning and administration of employment and training programs to state and local government units known as CETA prime sponsors.[6] These prime sponsors were state governments, units of general local government (cities, counties) containing populations of 100,000 or more or combinations of local governments (consortiums) containing at least one general local government unit meeting the above population criterion. State governments in some instances administered CETA employment and training programs for the entire population of the state (e.g., South Carolina, Vermont) while in most other cases they administered programs for that portion of the population of the state not covered by local CETA prime sponsors. The latter prime sponsors are known as Balance of State prime sponsors. During the first year of CETA program operations, beginning in July of 1974, there were 403 prime sponsors administering CETA Title One programs throughout the nation.[7]

The overall goals of the 1973 CETA legislation were spelled out by the Congress in the Act itself. The official Statement of Purpose appearing under Section 2 of the 1973 Act stated that,

> It is the purpose of this Act to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed persons, and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment opportunities and enhance self-sufficiency by establishing a flexible and decentralized system of Federal, State, and local programs. 8

Developments in the CETA System Since 1974

The CETA system as envisioned in the 1973 legislation was primarily designed to provide comprehensive employment and training services (outreach, assessment, counseling, basic literacy training, occupationally-oriented institutional and OJT training, work experience, job development and placement) to the unemployed and economically disadvantaged. The initial Act also contained provisions under Title II for a relatively small-scale public service employment program ($370 million) for areas of substantial unemployment; i.e., an area characterized by an unemployment rate of at least 6.5 percent for three consecutive months.[9]

The fundamental purposes, structure, and funding levels of CETA programs have undergone some rather dramatic transformations and fluctuations since the initial passage of the 1973 legislation. Shortly following the onset of local CETA operations in July of 1974, the nation entered into a severe economic recession that eventually drove the 1975 annual average unemployment rate up to 8.5 percent. This represented the highest annual average rate of unemployment that the nation had experienced during the entire post-World War II period.[10] In response to these increased unemployment problems, beginning in December of 1974 and continuing through 1977, the Congress passed a series of acts that substantially expanded the number of public service employment opportunities available under CETA.[11]

In the summer of 1977, Congress passed and President Carter signed into law the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977. This demonstration projects act provided funding for four additional types of youth employment and training programs that were designed to both increase immediate employment opportunities for youth and provide them with a range of employment and training services to enhance their long-term employability.[12]

In the fall of 1977, the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration provided funding under a competitive bid process to CETA prime sponsors for the planning, design, and implementation of longer-term employer-oriented skills training programs. This national demonstration program known as the Skill Training Improvement Program (STIP) was primarily designed to involve the private sector more closely in the planning and design

24

of CETA skills training programs, particularly for more highly skilled occupational areas.[13] By linking training programs more closely to the specific skill needs of private sector employers, it was felt that the overall quality of CETA skills training programs and the placement performance of those programs would be improved. This initial movement toward increased private sector involvement in CETA program planning and operations was accelerated by the passage of Title VII of the 1978 CETA Amendments.[14] Title VII provided funding for a new set of CETA programs known as the Private Sector Initiatives Programs (PSIP) and mandated the creation by prime sponsors of new employer-dominated advisory bodies known as Private Industry Councils to guide the planning and design of all program activities funded under Title VII.[15]

The CETA Act itself was reauthorized by the Congress in the fall of 1978. The legislation known as the 1978 CETA Amendments contained a number of key provisions affecting the targeting, planning, and administration of CETA programs. The eligibility criteria established by the Congress, particularly for participation in Title II structural programs, placed primary emphasis upon the delivery of employment and training services to the economically disadvantaged.[16] Prime sponsors were required to develop a comprehensive master plan for their CETA programs as well as annual plans for program under each major CETA Title.[17] The 1978 CETA Amendments also attempted to shift the emphasis of the CETA system away from the creation of subsidized employment opportunities toward the preparation of the economically disadvantaged for unsubsidized employment in the private sector. As noted above, the Act also contained provisions for promoting increased private sector involvement in the planning and design of CETA skills training programs.

Public Service Employment Programs

Shortly after CETA prime sponsors began program operations under the 1973 legislation, the Congress embarked upon an expansion of public service employment programs (PSE) as a strategy for combating the rising overall levels of unemployment generated by the economic recession of 1974-75. In December of 1974, the Congress passed Public Law 93-567: The Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974.[18] This Act authorized $875 million for the creation of additional public service employment opportunities for the unemployed and underemployed.[19] These "countercyclical" PSE programs were to be administered by CETA prime sponsors under a new CETA Title, Title VI. Largely as a result of the implementation of Title VI PSE programs, total enrollments in PSE activities of prime sponsors rose from 53,000 in September 1974 to 369,000 in March of 1976.[20]

In October of 1976, CETA Title VI PSE programs were reauthorized and expanded by the Congress, with the passage of Public Law 94-444: The Emergency Jobs Programs Extension Act of 1976.[21] The Act called for the development of short-duration (one year) PSE projects by CETA prime sponsors and for increased targeting of Title VI PSE positions toward the long-term, low income unemployed. All of the participants in the newly-created Title VI PSE projects and one-half of all replacements for existing Title VI PSE positions were to be either long-term unemployed members of low income families or public assistance recipients.[22] The projects approach to PSE job creation and the increased targeting of PSE resources upon the economically disadvantaged were expected to reduce the amount of substitution occurring in CETA PSE programs, thereby increasing the number of net new jobs generated by prime sponsors with their PSE monies.[23]

Shortly upon assuming office in January of 1977, the Carter Administration embarked upon a major further expansion of public service employment opportunities under CETA. The Economic Stimulus Appropriations Act enacted in May 1977 authorized approximately $8 billion in funding for CETA Title II and VI PSE programs during FY 77 and FY 78.[24] The funds provided under the Act allowed for an expansion of PSE enrollments under Title II and VI programs from a level of 298,000 in May of 1977 to slightly more than 750,000 by the end of March of 1978.[25]

The substantial growth in resources for CETA PSE programs between 1974 and 1977-78 substantially altered the nature of the overall CETA system. The system shifted from one intially focused on providing comprehensive employment and training services to the unemployed and economically disadvantaged to prepare them for unsubsidized employment in the private sector to one geared to creating subsidized employment opportunities for the unemployed and the disadvantaged in the public and private non-profit sectors. For example, during FY 78, total enrollments in public service employment positions under CETA Title I, II, and VI programs were approximately equal to 1.2 million, with Title VI countercyclical PSE programs accounting for more than 81 percent of the total.[26] In comparison, total FY 78 enrollments in classroom training and on-the-job training programs under the same three CETA Titles were only equal to 781,300, with classroom training activities including basic literacy training accounting for three-fourths of those enrollments. The emphasis on CETA PSE activities during these years reduced somewhat the overall need and demands for comprehensive local occupational information in planning CETA activities. The need for occupational information is more closely related to CETA activities geared to the eventual placement of the unemployed and economically disadvantaged into unsubsidized jobs in the private sector.

During the past two years, the scope and nature of CETA PSE activities have changed in several substantive ways. First, the overall level of enrollments in PSE activities has fallen sharply, partly as a result of the decline in overall national unemployment since the depths of the 1974-75 recession and partly as a result of the shift in Congressional emphasis away from CETA PSE programs and toward employability development programs geared to private sector job opportunities. By December of 1979, enrollments in PSE programs under Titles II D and VI of CETA were equal to only 394,638, a level approximately only one-half that of its peak in March of 1978.[27] Overall PSE enrollments are expected to rise somewhat during the remainder of Fiscal Year 1980 to a level of approximately 450,000.[28]

Second, there has simultaneously occurred with the overall reduction in PSE opportunities under CETA a shift in emphasis away from countercyclical PSE activities under Title VI of CETA toward "structural" PSE activities under the Title II D PSE programs authorized by the 1978 CETA Amendments. The Title II D programs are targeted strictly upon the economically disadvantaged, and public assistance recipients are automatically eligible for participation in Title IV programs.[29] During December of 1979, enrollments under Title II D programs were approximately 50 percent of total enrollments under CETA Title II D and VI programs combined, and it has been estimated that Title II D enrollments will represent approximately 56 percent of combined Title II D and VI enrollments at the end of FY 80.[30] Third, the 1978 CETA Amendments contained provisions that should eventually increase the employability development aspects of PSE programs. The 1978 CETA Amendments called upon CETA prime sponsors to devote a minimum of 15 percent of their FY 80 Title II D monies and 5 percent of their Title VI monies for training services for participants to increase their likelihood of successfully obtaining unsubsidized employment upon termination.[31] If CETA PSE activities come to be viewed primarily as an employability development strategy for participants, the need for and use of occupational information in the planning and design of these activities will increase.

Recent Trends in CETA Youth Employment and Training Programs

As noted earlier in this Chapter, the Congress passed demonstration youth employment and training legislation during the summer of 1977. In August of that year, President Carter signed into law the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977 (YEDPA).[32] The legislation was designed to provide funding for a series of demonstration programs to combat the continuing high levels of unemployment among the nation's youth, with particular emphasis upon the employment problems of economically disadvantaged youth.[33]

The YEDPA Act created four new categories of employment and training programs for youth under CETA. These four newly-created programs were the Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP), Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP), Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (YCCIP), and the Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC). The first three of the above YEDPA programs were authorized under amendments to Title III of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act while the YACC program was created under a separate new title of CETA (Title VIII). During FY 78, the first year of YEDPA operations, Federal obligations for the above four programs were $983.5 million and first-time enrollments were 398,000.[34] The Young Adult Conservation Corps was funded for three years, ending in September 30, 1980. Funding for the YIEPP, YETP, and YCCIP programs was initially authorized for only one year (FY 78). These three YEDPA-related programs are now authorized under Title IV of CETA as amended in 1978.

The goals, structure, and targeting features of YEDPA-related employment and training programs do differ in a number of substantive ways. The YETP and YCCIP programs were designed to achieve a number of different goals and objectives.[35] The general goals of these two programs were:

23

> To employ and increase the future employability of young persons, to help coordinate and improve existing career development, employment and training programs, and to test different approaches to solving the employment problems of youth. 36

Participants in YETP programs, the largest of the four major YEDPA programs, were expected to be provided with a wide range of employment and training services to enhance their long-term employability. Among the services to be provided to youth were a number of transition services designed to facilitate the transition from school to unsubsidized employment, including career counseling and guidance and the provision of labor market and occupational information.[37] To facilitate the development of occupational information for use in counseling youth participants in YEDPA programs, the YEDPA Act authorized additional funding for the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee. NOICC was called upon by the Congress to provide on-going technical assistance to the states in their efforts to develop comprehensive occupational information systems and disseminate such information to Local Educational Agencies for use in the career counseling and guidance of students.[38] The Act also contained provisions calling upon the governors to use their discretionary YEDPA monies to assume a leadership role in the occupational information area.[39]

As noted above, funding for the YIEPP, YETP, and YCCIP programs is currently authorized under Title IV of the CETA Act as amended in 1978. The authorization for the above three programs as well as for YACC programs expires at the end of FY 80. The Carter Administration has recently been involved in preparing new legislation for youth employment and training programs. The administration was expected to present its bill, the Youth Act of 1980, to the Congress in March of this year.[40]

The 1978 CETA Amendments and Their Influence Upon the Structure and Goals of CETA Programs

Funding for the CETA system was reauthorized by the Congress in 1978 in *Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978*. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the 1978 CETA Amendments have influenced the CETA system in a number of substantive ways. The impacts of the 1978 Amendments upon basic goals of the CETA system, the structure of the CETA system, the targeting of CETA resources, and linkages between CETA programs and the private sector are discussed in more detail below.

First, the basic goals of CETA programs were modified somewhat by the 1978 amendments. In addition to the goals of increasing employment opportunities and enhancing the self-sufficiency of program participants, the 1978 CETA Amendments also cite the goals of increasing the earned incomes of program participants and linking CETA program activities more closely with those of economic development, vocational education, and public assistance programs. The Statement of Purpose of the 1978 legislation notes that:

> It is the purpose of this Act to provide job training and employment opportunities for economically disadvantaged, unemployed, or underemployed persons which will result in an increase in their earned income, and to assure that training and other services lead to maximum employment opportunities and enhance self-sufficiency... It is further the purpose of this Act to provide for the maximum feasible coordination of plans, programs, and activities under this Act with economic development, community development, and related activities, such as vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, public assistance, self-employment training, and social service programs.

Second, the 1978 Amendments rearranged the Titles of the Act under which many of the previously existing CETA employment and training programs were authorized. As a result of the 1978 CETA Amendments, Titles II B, II C, and II D of the Act, respectively, provide funding for comprehensive employment and training services for the disadvantaged, upgrading programs, and structural PSE programs. Title III of the Act authorizes monies for special national programs, including programs for the handicapped, older workers, Native Americans, and migrant and seasonal farmworkers. Title IV authorizes funding for youth programs, including the YIEPP, YCCIP, and YETP programs under YEDPA, the Job Corps, and the summer Youth Program, now referred to as the Summer Youth Employment Program.[41] Countercyclical PSE programs continue to be authorized under Title VI of CETA. Title VII created a new CETA program, the Private Sector Initiatives Program, designed to increase private sector involvement in the planning and design of CETA programs. Finally, Title VIII authorizes monies for the Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC).

During FY 1980, slightly more than $6.4 billion will be available to CETA prime sponsors for administering employment and training programs under the Act.[42] Approximately $1.8 billion, or 28.1 percent of the FY 80 monies, are allocated to program activities under Title II A, B, and C. Another $3.36

billion, or 52.2 percent is allocated to PSE activities under Titles II D and VI, with the countercyclical PSE programs accounting for slightly more than half of the combined allocation. Title IV YETP and YCCIP youth programs will receive approximately $665 million, accounting for 10.3 percent of the total allocation. Finally, PSIP program activities under Title VII were allocated $293 million, accounting for 4.5 percent of the total FY 80 CETA allocation to prime sponsors.

Third, the 1978 CETA Amendments placed increased emphasis upon the targeting of CETA employment and training resources toward the economically disadvantaged.[43] In his 1978 Manpower Message, Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall outlined the Administration's plans with respect to influencing the targeting provisions of CETA programs. The Secretary remarked that:[44]

> To reduce unemployment among minority and other disadvantaged groups, the administration has proposed that the training and employment provisions of CETA be amended to assure that these services are targeted to meet the needs of economically disadvantaged Americans.

Under the 1978 CETA Amendments, the eligibility criteria for participation in CETA Title II B, Title II D, and Title VII programs require that applicants be economically disadvantaged. While Title VI participants are not required to be economically disadvantaged, members of families receiving cash public assistance are automatically eligible for participation in such programs. The eligibility criteria for YETP and YCCIP youth programs also do not require participants to be members of economically disadvantaged families; however, the Act does call upon prime sponsors to make good faith efforts to select youths "experiencing severe handicaps in obtaining employment" for participation in such programs.[45] The increased emphasis upon the delivery of CETA employment and training services to the economically disadvantaged has substantially increased the demands for more current and detailed information on the magnitude and characteristics (demographic, socioeconomic, labor force) of the economically disadvantaged populations within prime sponsor planning areas. Meeting the demands for such planning information has posed and will continue to pose a substantial challenge to the existing labor market and occupational information systems at the national, state, and local levels.[46]

Finally, the 1978 CETA Amendments contained a series of provisions designed to link the planning and design of CETA training efforts more closely to the employment needs of the private sector. As noted earlier, the renewed efforts of the Department of Labor to involve the private sector more closely in CETA training activities date back to 1977, with the authorization of monies under the Economic Stimulus Appropriations Act of 1977 for the funding on a competitive basis of the Skill Training Improvement Programs.[47] These STIP programs funded under Title III of the CETA Act were intended to demonstrate the feasibility of obtaining the active involvement of private sector employers in the planning, design, and operations of high quality skills training programs for the long-term unemployed and economically disadvantaged.[48] The 1978 CETA Amendments authorized the funding of the Private Sector Initiatives Program (PSIP) under Title VII and mandated the creation of Private Industry Councils (PIC's) by CETA prime sponsors to guide the planning and design of all program activities under Title VII.

The 1978 CETA Amendments and the rules and regulations for Title VII programs have called upon the PIC's to undertake analyses of job opportunities in the local private economy, including the development of estimates of the number of such employment opportunities by industry, occupational area, and geographic location.[49] To obtain such information, many PIC's throughout the nation have been involved in designing and implementing local employer surveys.[50] The proper role of employer surveys in planning Title VII and Title II B training programs will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4 of this report. It is quite evident at this point in time, however, that the passage of the 1978 CETA Amendments, particularly the Title VII legislation, has substantially increased the demands for local occupational information in the planning of CETA employment and training programs of prime sponsors throughout the nation.

The Role and Use of Labor Market and Occupational Information in CETA Policymaking and Program Planning

The decentralization of decisionmaking authority over the planning and administration of employment and training programs brought about by the passage of CETA legislation has increased the need for effective program management, planning, and evaluation at the state and local level. The primary justification for the delegation of authority over the planning, design, and administration of employment and training programs to state and local governments was that local control over such programs would lead to the more efficient delivery of employment and training services. It was also hoped that decentralization would assist in the development of employment and training programs that were more effective in combating the employment and earnings problems of the unemployed, underemployed, and economically disadvantaged populations within prime sponsor planning areas. In the final analysis, the success of the CETA system will be dependent upon the development of effective prime sponsor decision-making capabilities. As the National Manpower Policy Task Force noted in its first report following the passage of the 1978 CETA legislation,

> While no piece of legislation can please everyone, the Act has the potential, given adequate funding, to significantly improve our nation's manpower efforts. Success will depend, however, on the way the Act is implemented and administered at the Federal, State, and local levels. Decentralization and decategorization are means and not an end: they are no guarantee of improved performance. CETA's potential will not be realized unless decisions are made wisely and this wisdom must be based on past experience. 51

In order to make such wise decisions, prime sponsors must be able to identify and measure the numbers and characteristics of CETA eligible residents in their planning areas; effectively analyze the nature and causes of the problems encountered by their unemployed, underemployed, and economically disadvantaged residents; design a mix of employment and training needs of the above groups; monitor and evaluate the short- and long-run performance of these alternative employment and training strategies in enhancing the employability and earnings of program participants; and utilize the findings of these monitoring and evaluation efforts to continuously make adjustments in the design of programs and the mix of employment and training services to achieve the basic goals and objectives of the local CETA system.[52]

To carry out the above tasks in an effective manner, CETA administrators, planners, program evaluators, and program managers must have access to timely and reliable information on labor force, aggregate employment, and industrial and occupational employment developments in their planning and local labor areas. This would include information on the numbers and characteristics of the unemployed, underemployed, and economically disadvantaged in the local planning area to allow for proper targeting of CETA resources;[53] information on aggregate employment levels and trends in local labor areas as well as information on growth industries and the occupational staffing patterns of local growth industries to allow for determination of the proper mix of employment and training services and the selection of appropriate occupational areas for the provision of institutional and OJT training;[54] information on the hiring requirements and hiring policies of local firms to design appropriate curriculum for training programs and to provide relevant occupational counseling and guidance to jobseekers; and information on the hiring activities of local firms to facilitate the job placement of terminees from CETA employment and training programs.

The needs of prime sponsors for timely and reliable information on local industrial and occupational employment developments, current and projected job openings by occupation, and employer hiring practices and policies should increase as the CETA system continues to move in the direction of an employability development oriented system. The long-term fate of the CETA system may well be dependent upon the ability of current CETA programs to effectively address the employment and training needs of the disadvantaged and the skills needs of employers in the private sector. As Mangum et al. have recently argued,

> Whereas past attention was riveted on its job creation capabilities, it is likely that future assessments will rest more specifically on planning and managerial capability, not because Congress will be qualified to assess those techniques but because, over the long run, it is the compatibility of its results to labor market need that CETA must be tested. 55

The remainder of this report will be devoted to a discussion of the labor market and occupational information needs of CETA prime sponsors for policymaking and program planning, operations, and evaluation purposes. The emphasis upon the information needs of state and local CETA prime sponsors does not imply that such information is not needed for effective policymaking at the national level. The labor market and occupational information systems of the nation should be utilized to provide key inputs into the CETA policymaking process at the national level in at least four major areas.

First, overall funding levels for CETA programs and the establishment of eligibility criteria for such programs should be based upon knowledge of the magnitude and nature of the problems of the unemployed, underemployed, and the economically disadvantaged. Knowledge of the demographic, socioeconomic, and labor force characteristics of the above three groups as well as the degree of overlap among them would be particularly useful in targeting CETA resources.[56]

Second, an understanding of the nature and causes of unemployment and labor market-related economic hardship throughout the nation will provide useful inputs into the allocation of resources among various CETA Titles.[57] Decisions with respect to the allocation of CETA monies among training, upgrading, and job creation activities should be based at least in part upon knowledge of the absolute and relative numbers of available job openings and the wages and employment stability characteristics of current and projected job openings.[58] Third, information on projected national trends in industry and occupational employment as well as expected job openings by occupation would be useful as a guide to overall CETA training activities and as inputs into state and local occupational projections programs.[59] Finally, knowledge of the long-term net impacts of participation in CETA activities upon the employment, wages, earnings, and industrial and occupational mobility of participants would be useful in guiding the future allocation of CETA resources among various employment and training activities (work experience, classroom training, OJT, PSE, job search).[60]

Outline of Remaining Chapters

The remainder of this report on labor force and occupational information needs of CETA prime sponsors is presented in four separate chapters. Chapter 2 will provide an overview of the prime sponsor planning process for CETA employment and training programs. This chapter will include a brief review of the organizational structure of the CETA prime sponsor delivery system throughout the nation, the planning process for CETA Title I and Title II programs under the 1978 CETA legislation, the major changes in the CETA planning process brought about by the 1978 CETA Amendments, the role of prime sponsor advisory councils in the planning and design of CETA programs, and the role of the regional offices of ETA in reviewing and approving prime sponsor's annual plans.

Chapter 3 will be primarily focused upon a description of the types of labor market and occupational information needed by prime sponsors for meeting the planning requirements for employment and training programs under the 1978 CETA legislation. The informational requirements for targeting CETA resources, designing the employment and training services mix, selecting occupational areas for training, designing the curriculum of training programs, developing unsubsidized jobs for program terminees, and evaluating the short- and long-term performance of local CETA employment and training programs will be described and assessed. The desirable characteristics of industrial and occupational employment data for CETA planning purposes, including their level of detail, geographic coverage, and frequency of publication, will be reviewed in this chapter.

Chapter 4 will examine the availability of existing data sources, both published and unpublished, to meet the policymaking and planning needs of CETA prime sponsors. The current or anticipated availability of various household survey data, establishment survey data, and data from the administrative records of SESA and other employment and training agencies will be reviewed and critically assessed.

Chapter 5 will provide a series of recommendations for improving the timeliness, availability, and usefulness of labor force and industrial and occupational employment data for planning local CETA programs. These recommendations will include short-range efforts aimed at increasing the availability and improving the formats of existing household surveys, establishment surveys, and administrative data. A number of longer-run efforts designed to expand or alter the nature of existing household and establishment surveys, to analyze the data from such surveys more rigorously, and to conduct research into the operations of local labor markets for workers in specific occupations will also be recommended. This chapter will also provide a discussion of the need for designing appropriate institutional mechanisms for improving the communications flow between labor market data users, particularly CETA prime sponsors, and the major labor market data producers, particularly the national and regional offices of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the State Employment Security Agencies.

Chapter 1: Footnotes

1. See: 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, Washington, D.C., 1973.

2. For a review of national political and economic developments influencing the decentralization of the employment and training system prior to the passage of CETA,

   See:
   - i) Ruttenberg, Stanley H. and Gutchess, Jocelyn, Manpower Challenge of the 1970's: Institutions and Social Change, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1970;
   - ii) Davidson, Roger H., The Politics of Comprehensive Manpower Legislation, the Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1972;
   - iii) Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training Programs at the Local Level, Volume I: The Role of Program Evaluation at the Local Level, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Boston, 1978.

3. For a relatively detailed review of the legislative development, administration, operations, and performance of these categorical employment and training programs,

   See:
   - i) Mangum, Garth L., MDTA: Foundation of Federal Manpower Policy, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1968;
   - ii) Mangum, Garth L., The Emergence of Manpower Policy, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., New York, 1969;
   - iii) Mangum, Garth L. and Walsh, John, A Decade of Manpower Development and Training, Olympus Publishing Company, Salt Lake City, 1973;
   - iv) Levitan, Sar A., The Great Society's Poor Law: A New Approach to Poverty, the Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1969;
   - v) Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert, The Promise of Greatness, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1976;
   - vi) Levitan, Sar A. and Johnston, Benjamin, The Job Corps: A Social Experiment That Works, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1975;
   - vii) Levine, Robert A., The Poor Ye Need Not Have With You:: Lessons from the War on Poverty, the MIT Press, Cambridge, 1970;

viii) Sundquist, James L. (Editor), On Fighting Poverty, Basic Books, New York, 1969;

ix) Cohen, Robert, "New Careers" Grows Older: A Perspective on the Paraprofessional Experience, 1965-1975, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1976;

x) U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, The Neighborhood Youth Corps: A Review of the Research, Manpower Research Monograph No. 13, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970;

xi) Mangum, Garth and Walsh, John, Employment and Training Programs for Youth: What Works Best for Whom?, National Council on Employment Policy, Washington, D.C., 1978;

xii) Doeringer, Peter B., et.al., Low-Income Labor Markets and Urban Manpower Programs: A Critical Assessment, Research and Development Findings No. 12, U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Washington, D.C., 1972;

xiii) Levitan, Sar A.; Mangum, Garth L.; and Taggart, Robert III, Economic Opportunity in the Ghetto: The Partnership of Government and Business, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1970;

xiv) Myers, Charles A., The Role of the Private Sector in Manpower Development, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1971;

xv) U.S. General Accounting Office, Evaluation of Results and Administration of the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS) Program in Five Cities, Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., 1971;

xvi) Mangum, Garth L. and Robson, R. Thayne, (Editors), Metropolitan Impact of Manpower Programs: A Four-City Comparison, Salt Lake City, Olympus Publishing Co., 1973;

xvii) U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Case Studies of the Emergency Employment Act in Operation, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973;

xviii) Taggart, Robert (Editor), Job Creation: What Works?, Olympus Publishing Company, Salt Lake City, 1977;

xix) Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert (Editors), The Emergency Employment Act: The PEP Generation, Olumpus Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1974;

xx) U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Manpower Report of the President: 1975, "Public Service Employment: Achievements and Open Issues," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975.

4. The Job Corps program and the Work Incentive Program (WIN) retained their separate identities after the passage of CETA in 1973. During FY 74, federal obligations for the Job Corps and Work Incentive Programs were $149.5 and $250.1 million, respectively.

   See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Manpower Report of the President: 1975, "Table F-1," p. 317.

5. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President: 1971, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971, p. xii.

6. The eligibility criteria for prime sponsorship of CETA Title I programs were spelled out in Section 102 of Title I of the Act. The final determination of eligibility is made by the Secretary of Labor. It should be noted that under certain circumstances, including a demonstrated capability for administering employment and training programs, units of local government not meeting the 100,000 population criterion could be designated by the Secretary of Labor as CETA prime sponsors. Among such areas were rural areas characterized by severe unemployment problems that had previously been involved in administering Concentrated Employment Programs.

   See: 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, "Section 102."

7. For a review of CETA prime sponsor program operations during the first year of the Act,

   See: i) U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Manpower Report of the President: 1975, "CETA Implementation: A Progress Report," pp. 79-101;

   ii) Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Impact on People, Places, Programs, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1976.

8. See: 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, "Section 2."

9. The $370 million dollars for Title II programs were appropriated by the Congress in June of 1974.

   See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Manpower Report of the President: 1975, pp. 81-83. The eligibility criteria and allocation formulas for Title II programs appeared in Sections 202 and 204 of the 1973 Act.

10. See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, "Table A-1," p. 233.

11. The December 1974 PSE expansion was funded under Public Law 93-567: The Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974. For a review of some of the issues surrounding the passage of this piece of legislation,

    See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Manpower Report of the President: 1975, "Public Service Employment: Achievements and Open Issues," pp. 39-51.

12. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-93: The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, August 1977.

13. For a brief overview of the funding levels and objectives of the STIP training programs,

    See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1978, "Program Performance in Fiscal 1977," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973, pp. 37-65.

14. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Title VII: Private Sector Opportunities for the Economically Disadvantaged," 1978.

15. The Act itself stated that "In no event shall representatives of industry and business have less than a majority on the council, and, whenever possible, at least half of such industry and business representatives shall be representatives of small business."

    See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 704 (a) (1)."

16. The Act itself provided definitions of the "economically disadvantaged." All participants in Title II B and Title II D programs were required to be members of the economically disadvantaged.

    See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 3," "Section 213," "Section 236 (a)."

17. The requirements for the development of the master plan were spelled out in Section 103 (a) of the 1978 CETA Amendments.

18. For a review of the legislative development, planning, design, and administration of PSE programs under CETA,

See: i) Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; and Greenspan, Harry J., Expanding Public Service Employment Under CETA: Preliminary Assessment, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1978;

ii) National Commission for Manpower Policy, Job Creation Through Public Service Employment, Volume II: Monitoring the Public Service Employment Program, Report No. 6, Washington, D.C., 1978;

iii) Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; Greenspan, Harry J.; and Seablom, Scott; CETA: Assessment of Public Service Employment Programs, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1979;

iv) National Commission for Manpower Policy, Monitoring the Public Service Employment Program: The Second Round, Special Report No. 32, Washington, D.C., March 1979;

v) Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; Greenspan, Harry; Seablom, Scott; and Black, Lois; The New CETA: Effect on Public Service Employment Programs, A Preliminary Report, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., September 1979.

19. The Act authorized funding for Title VI PSE positions for an initial period of 18 months, ending on June 30, 1976.

20. These enrollments included participants in PSE activities under CETA Title I, II, and VI programs as well as individuals enrolled in activities funded with monies under the Emergency Employment Act.

See: Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; Greenspan, Harry J; and Seablom, Scott; CETA: Assessment of Public Service Employment Programs, "Table 1," p. 52.

21. In Section 13 of Public Law 94-444, the Congress mandated the creation of a national commission to review the adequacy of the nation's labor force statistics system for national economic policymaking and for formulating appropriate employment and training policies and programs. For a review of factors influencing the establishment of the commission,

See: i) Bregger, John E., "A New Employment Statistics Review Commission," Monthly Labor Review, March 1977, pp. 14-20.

ii) U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1977, "Measurement of Employment and Unemployment," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977, pp. 29-39.

The final report of the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics was released in September 1979.

See: National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

22. "Low-Income" families were defined as families with annualized incomes less than or equal to 70 percent of the appropriate BLS lower living budget for the geographic area in which they resided.

23. For a more detailed discussion of the "displacement" or "substitution" effects of PSE programs,

See: i) National Commission for Manpower Policy, Job Creation Through Public Service Employment, Volume II: Monitoring the Public Service Employment Program; pp. 14-49;

ii) National Commission for Manpower Policy, Monitoring the Public Service Employment Program: The Second Round, pp. 3-56.

24. See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1978, pp. 38-42.

25. See: i) Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; Greenspan, Harry J.; and Seablom, Scott; CETA: Assessment of Public Service Employment Programs, "Table 4," p. 57;

ii) Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; Greenspan, Harry; Seablom, Scott; and Black, Lois; The New CETA: Effect on Public Service Employment Programs, A Preliminary Report, "Table 1-1," p. 13.

The May 1977 enrollment data for Titles II and VI programs pertain to May 13 of that year while the March 1978 enrollment data pertain to the end of the quarter (March 31).

26. The enrollment data for FY 78 CETA programs appear in the following publication.

See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, "Table F-2," p. 364.

27. See: "ETA to Increase PSE Planning Levels: December Enrollment Figures Are Low," Employment and Training Reporter, Volume II, Number 19, January 23, 1980, pp. 545-546.

28. Ibid, p. 545.

29. The eligibility criteria for Title II D programs require that an applicant be economically disadvantaged, be unemployed at time of application, and be unemployed for 15 out of the 20-week period immediately prior to the date of application. Members of families receiving cash public assistance

or eligible to receive such assistance are also automatically eligible for participation in Title II D programs. The eligibility criteria for Title VI programs require the applicant to have been unemployed for 10 of the last 12 weeks, to be unemployed at time of application, and to be a member of a family whose annualized income (based on a three-month annualization factor) is equal to or less than 100 percent of the appropriate BLS lower living standard income level for the geographic area in which he or she resides. As noted in the text, members of families receiving cash public assistance or eligible to receive such assistance are automatically eligible for participation in Title VI programs.

See: i) 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 236 (a)," "Section 607;"

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," Federal Register, Tuesday April 3, 1979, "Section 675.5-5" and "Section 675.5-6," p. 20001.

30. At the end of December 1979, PSE enrollments in Title II D and VI programs were equal to 394,638, of which 193,009 or 48.9 percent were enrolled in Title II D programs.

See: "ETA to Increase PSE Planning Levels: December Enrollment Figures are Low," Employment and Training Reporter, January 23, 1980, pp. 545-546.

31. The minimum percentage of Title II D monies that must be devoted to training activities is scheduled to increase to 20 percent in FY 81 and to 22 percent in FY 82. The employability development services provided to PSE participants under Title VI can include "employability counseling" as well as training services.

See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 232" and "Section 603 (a)."

The national office of the Employment and Training Administration has recently been involved in developing guidelines for enforcing the compliance of prime sponsors with a number of major PSE requirements, including those related to the provision of training to PSE program participants.

See: "ETA Drafts Guidelines for Enforcing Compliance with PSE Requirements," Employment and Training Reporter, Volume 11, Number 24, February 27, 1980, pp. 681-682.

32. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-93: Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, Washington, D.C., 1977.

For a more detailed review of the legislative background and purposes of the YEDPA programs, See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, A Planning Charter for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, Washington, D.C., 1977;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, Putting America's Future to Work, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978;

iii) U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1978, "Youth Unemployment and Public Policy," pp. 69-81.

33. For a review of recent findings on the unemployment problems of youth, including the particular employment problems of minority and economically disadvantaged youth,

See: i) Congressional Budget Office, The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What Are the Options?, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976;

ii) Adams, Arvil V. and Mangum, Garth L., The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1978;

iii) Bowers, Norman, "Young and Marginal: An Overview of Youth Employment," Monthly Labor Review, October 1979, pp. 4-18;

iv) Sum, Andrew M.; Meehan, Edward; and Drago, Jack; "Trends in the Labor Force Status of Youth in New England: Implications for Targetting Youth Employment and Training Resources," Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1980.

34. See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, "Table F-1," p. 364.

Of the $983.5 million in total Federal obligations for the four YEDPA programs, $756.1 million, or 76.9 percent, was allocated to YIEPP, YETP, and YCCIP programs,

See: Ibid, "Table F-3," p. 365.

35. For a review of the YETP and YCCIP program operations of CETA prime sponsors during FY 78,

See: i) National Council on Employment Policy, Initial Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) Experience at the Local Level, Report No. 1, Washington, D.C., February 1978;

ii) National Council on Employment Policy, The Unfolding Youth Initiatives: Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA), Report No. 2, Washington, D.C., August 1978;

iii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, Youth Initiatives, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978;

iv) Sum, Andrew; Harrington, Paul; Schneider, Glen; et. al., Findings of the Prime Sponsors FY 78 Year End Reports on YEDPA Program Operations, A Report Prepared for the Office of Youth Programs, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1980.

36. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, "Youth Programs Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act," Federal Register, September 16, 1977, Part IV, p. 46728.

37. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-93: The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, "Section 342(a) (3)."

Participants in YETP in-school career employment experience programs were expected to be provided with a minimum number of transition services, including career counseling, guidance, and information,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, "Youth Programs Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act," Op.cit., p. 46737.

38. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-93: The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, "Section 348 (c) 1."

39. Ibid., "Section 343 (c)."

40. For a review of recent developments with respect to the submission of this bill to the Congress as well as the provisions of Title I of the bill,

See: "Hufstedler Testifies on Education Portion of Youth Act of 1980" and "Administration Youth Proposals," Employment and Training Reporter, Volume II, Number 24, February 27, 1980, pp. 679-680, 701-705, respectively.

41. The Employment and Training Administration has recently announced that $708 million has been obligated for the FY 1980 summer youth program.

See: "SYEP Grants of $760 Million Announced," Employment and Training Reporter, Volume II, Number 24, Feb. 27, 1980, p. 691.

42. The allocations cited in this paragraph appeared in the following ETA publication: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "CETA Programs Get $6.4 Billion," ETA Interchange, Vol. V, No. 11, November 1979, pp. 1, 7.

43. For a more detailed discussion of the issues related to the targeting of CETA resources,

See: National Commission for Manpower Policy, CETA: An Analysis of the Issues, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978, pp. 10-17, 63-104.

44. U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Halth, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1978, p. 5.

45. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 444(a)."

46. The national office of ETA has recently developed a new set of methodologies for use by State Employment Security Agencies (SESA's) in meeting the planning data needs of CETA prime sponsors with respect to the determination of the characteristics of the local CETA-eligible populations.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Guidelines for the Development of Labor Market Information Needed for CETA Planning Purposes, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

47. The STIP program received approximately $325 million in funding during FY 78. During the first round of STIP funding, 142 prime sponsors were involved in operating STIP programs.

See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, p. 46.

48. For a review and assessment of the operations of STIP training programs in the U.S. and in the Massachusetts Balance of State Prime Sponsor planning area,

See:

i) Abt Associates, Inc., Evaluation of the Skill Training Improvement Program (STIP), Phase I: Starting Up, A Report Prepared for the Office of Program Evaluation, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1979;

ii) McLaughlin, Francis, "CETA and the Private Sector: Employer Involvement in the STIP Program in Massachusetts, "Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning, and Evaluation, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1980.

49. See: i) 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 703 (a);"

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," Federal Register, Vol. 44, No. 65, April 3, 1979, p. 20050.

For a more detailed review of PSIP goals and objectives and the role of the PIC's,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, The New Business Look in Employment and Training Programs, Region X, ETA, Seattle, 1979;

ii) Chamber of Commerce of the United States, The New Private Sector Initiative Program, Washington, D.C., 1979.

50. See: i) Ohio State University Research Foundation, A Formative Evaluation of the Private Sector Initiative Program, Report No. 1, Prepared for the Office of Program Evaluation, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Columbus, 1979;

ii) Sum, Andrew; Ganz, Russell; Harrington, Paul; and Burns, Susan; An Overview of the Organizational Structure and Operations of PSIP Programs in New England, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, forthcoming, 1980.

51. See: National Manpower Policy Task Force, The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Opportunities and Challenges, Washington, D.C., April, 1979, p. 1.

52. For a more detailed review of the tasks involved in planning and evaluating comprehensive CETA employment and training programs,

See: i) Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training at the Local Level, Volume II: The Use of Process, Outcome, and Benefit-Cost Evaluation Techniques, pp. 1-51;

ii) Harrison, Bennett; Kelley, Maryellen; Shkilnyk, Anastasia; and Sum, Andrew; A Manual for CETA Prime Sponsors on the Monitoring and Evaluation of Title One Programs for Employment and Training, Second Edition, National Civil Service League, Washington, D.C., 1976, particularly pp. 174-239;

iii) Mangum, Garth L.; Morlock, James; Pines, Marion; and Snedeker, David; Job Market Futurity, particularly pp. 115-143.

53. Studies of the characteristics of the unemployed and the poor/economically disadvantaged in the United States, Massachusetts, and New England have revealed that the poor and the unemployed are quite distinct groups.

See: i) Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert III, Employment and Earnings Inadequacy: A New Social Indicator, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1974;

ii) Norwood, Janet, Some Social Aspects of Unemployment, Report 469, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1976;

iii) McLaughlin, Maureen and Sum, Andrew, Interrelationships Between Unemployment an Poverty in Massachusetts: Implications for State Employment and Training Policy, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978;

iv) Bouba, Maryann and Sum, Andrew, Targetting CETA Resources: An Analysis of the Demographic and Labor Force Characteristics of Massachusetts Family Heads Potentially Eligible for CETA-Related Employment and Training Programs, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978;

v) Sum, Andrew; Meehan, Edward, and Ganz, Russell, "The Economically Disadvantaged in New England: Implication for Targetting CETA Resources," The New England Journal of Employment and Training, forthcoming, April, 1980.

54. Knowledge of replacement demand by occupation due to deaths, retirements, and temporary withdrawals from the labor force is also needed for determining appropriate occupational areas for training. The BLS national projections of annual average job openings by occupation during the 1974-85 period revealed that approximately 70 percent of all such openings would be due to replacement needs.

See: Carey, Max L., "Revised Occupational Projections to 1985," Monthly Labor Review, November 1976, pp. 10-22.

55. See: Mangum, Garth; Morlock, James; Pines, Marion W.; Snedeker, David; Job Market Futurity, Olympus Publishing Company, Salt Lake City, 1979.

56. Previous studies have shown that the number of underemployed/subemployed persons and the number of persons outside of the labor force desiring jobs are nearly as large as the annual average number of unemployed persons throughout the nation. A relatively high proportion of the individuals outside of the labor force desiring jobs are economically disadvantaged or

members of population subgroups frequently cited as major target groups for the delivery of employment and training services.

See: i) Ginzberg, Eli, "The Job Problem," Scientific American, Vol. 237, No. 5, November 1977, pp. 43-51;

ii) Ginzberg, Eli, "The Scope for Structural Policies in Achieving Full Employment: A North American Perspective," Structural Determinants of Employment and Unemployment, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, 1977, pp. 43-50;

iii) Bouba, Maryann and Sum, Andrew, The Extent of Job Desires of Persons Outside of the Labor Force in the United States and Massachusetts: Implications for Targetting CETA-Related Employment and Training Resources, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

57. In the 1973 and 1978 CETA legislation, the Congress called upon the Secretary of Labor to undertake research work to provide the necessary data elements for constructing an annual measure of labor market-related economic hardship. The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics was also asked to provide recommendations on the need for producing an annual measure of labor market-related economic hardship. The Commission supported the publication of an annual report on labor market-related economic hardship, but opposed, with several dissensions, the actual construction and estimation of values for an annual economic hardship index for the nation.

See: i) 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203; Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, "Section 312(c);"

ii) 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 312(c);"

iii) 94th U.S. Congress, Public Law 94-444: Emergency Jobs Program Extension Act of 1976, "Section 13(d) (2) (I);"

iv) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 57-81.

Previous efforts to construct and estimate values for indices of economic hardship have revealed that low wages of jobs rather than unemployment is the principal cause of labor market-related economic hardship.

See: i) Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert J., Employment and Earnings Inadequacy: A New Social Indicator, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1974;

ii) Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert J., "Do Our Statistics Measure the Real Labor Market Hardship?," A paper presented to the American Statistical Association Annual Meeting, Boston, August 1976;

iii) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 72-79.

58. The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics was also asked to review the need for additional job vacancy data. Despite the fact that several of the authors of background papers for the Commission supported the need for and usefulness of such data, the Commission recommended against the funding of a new national job vacancy survey unless a number of conceptual and measurement problems can be successfully overcome.

See: i) 94th U.S. Congress, Public Law 94-444: Emergency Jobs Program Extension Act of 1976, "Section 13(d) (2) (F);"

ii) Frumerman, Harry, Job Vacancy Statistics in the United States, Background Paper No. 3., National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1979;

iii) Perlman, Richard, "Comments on Harry Frumerman's Paper," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 638-640;

iv) Wool, Harold, "Some Analytical Shortcomings of Occupational Data on Employed and Unemployed Workers," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 539-568.

For a review of the issues involved in utilizing job vacancy data to classify unemployment into various categories (frictional, structural, cyclical),

See: i) Konstant, Raymond and Winegeard, F.O., "Analysis and Use of Job Vacancy Statistics," Monthly Labor Review, August 1968, pp. 22-31;

ii) Joseph, Myron L., "Job Vacancy Measurement," The Journal of Human Resources, Fall 1966;

iii) Rosenthal, Neal; Harrington, Paul; Sommers, Dixie; and Terlizzi, Lois; Issues Underlying the Development of Job Vacancy Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1977;

iv) Sum, Andrew, "Issues Related to the Purposes, Collection, Analysis, and Interpretation of Job Vacancy Statistics," Proceedings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Job Vacancy Statistics Conference, Washington, D.C., April 1978, pp. 47-75.

59. For a recent overview of issues related to the existing BLS/SESA occupational projections program,

See: Lecht, Leonard A., "Occupational Projections for National, State, and Local Areas," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 509-534.

The BLS national labor force, economic, and industrial employment projections through 1980 are presented in the following volume:

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment Projections for the 1980's, Bulletin 2030, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

60. In Section 313 (a) of the 1973 CETA Act, Congress called upon the Secretary of Labor to carry out continuous evaluations of the effectiveness of all program activities funded under the Act. To help meet this mandate, the Employment and Training Administration has funded a continuous longitudinal follow-up survey of a national sample of participants in various CETA program activities.

See:

i) Westat, Inc., Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey: Technical Report No. 1, Methodology, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1977;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Evaluation Report-1979, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979;

iii) Brandwein, Seymour, "Long-Term DOL Performance Measurement," Paper Presented to the U.S. Department of Labor Conference on CETA Title II Performance Measures, Virginia, February 1980.

Chapter 2

The Nature of the CETA Prime Sponsor Planning Process

CETA Prime Sponsors

The 1973 CETA legislation granted authority over the planning and administration of employment and training programs funded under the Act to state and local government units known as CETA prime sponsors. The CETA Act and the rules and regulations governing CETA Programs spelled out the criteria to be utilized by the Secretary of Labor in determining the eligibility of state and local government units for prime sponsorship.[1] As noted in chapter 1 of this report, prime sponsors of CETA Title I programs included state governments, units of general local government containing 100,000 or more residents, combinations of local government units (prime sponsor consortia) containing at least one unit of general local government meeting the above population criterion, and specially-designated prime sponsors, including consortia units of general local governments not meeting the above population criterion who represent a substantial portion of a local labor area and selected rural areas characterized by severe unemployment problems.[2]

The number of prime sponsors delivering CETA-related employment and training services has expanded continuously since the passage of the 1973 CETA legislation. As noted in the previous chapter, there were 403 CETA prime sponsors in the first year of CETA program operations; i.e., FY 1975. During FY 1980, there are 473 CETA prime sponsors.[3] The increase in prime sponsors during the past five years has largely occurred as a result of the breakup of prime sponsor consortia and Balance of State prime sponsors.[4] During FY 1980, the 473 CETA prime sponsors consisted of 78 cities, 196 counties, 138 local government consortia, 57 state or balance of state prime sponsors, and 4 rural prime sponsors having previously administered Concentrated Employment Programs.[5]

The substantial variation in the geographic boundaries of CETA prime sponsors does create a number of problems for the planning of CETA programs. Prior to the passage of CETA legislation, the bulk of the labor force and employment data produced by Federal and state agencies pertained to states or local labor areas. Many CETA prime sponsors comprise either only a portion of a local labor area (particularly city prime sponsors) or parts of many different local labor areas in a state (Balance of State prime sponsors). The existence of these differences between the geographic boundaries of CETA prime sponsors and those of state and local labor areas has posed at times particularly severe problems for CETA prime sponsors. While the planning of training and other employability development activities should be based upon current and projected employment data for entire local labor areas or combinations of contiguous local labor areas, the targeting of CETA services must be based upon data pertaining to the magnitude and characteristics of the unemployed and economically disadvantaged populations residing in the prime sponsor's planning area.[6] A more detailed discussion of the issues related to the appropriate geographic coverage of data for planning CETA employment and training programs will be presented in chapters 3 and 4 of this report.

The Planning of CETA Title I and II Programs Under the 1973 CETA Act

The 1973 CETA legislation primarily provided funding to prime sponsors for the operations of employment and training programs under two different CETA Titles, i.e., Title I and II.[7] Title I programs were intended to provide a comprehensive range of employment and training services to participants, including outreach, assessment, counseling, basic literacy training, occupationally-oriented classroom training, on-the-job training, work experience, and public service employment.[8] Title II was initially intended to provide funding to prime sponsors for a small scale public service employment program for the unemployed and underemployed residing in areas of substantial unemployment.

The 1973 CETA Act spelled out the general goals of Title I and II programs, outlined the nature of the planning process to be followed by prime sponsors receiving funding under the Act, described the eligibility criteria for participation in programs under these two Titles, listed the general types of services that could be provided to participants under each Title, and described the role of prime sponsor planning councils, the State Manpower Services Councils, and the role of the regional offices of ETA in reviewing and/or approving prime sponsor's plans. The rules and regulations for these programs provided more detailed guidance on the planning process, eligibility criteria, allowable activities under the Act, and the plan review and approval process.[9]

In the 1973 CETA Act, the Congress spelled out the general goals of Title I programs in the following manner:

> It is the purpose of this Title to establish a program to provide comprehensive manpower services throughout the nation. Such a program shall include the development and creation of job opportunities and the training, education, and other services needed to enable individuals to secure and retain employment at their maximum capacity. 10

To receive fiscal assistance under the Act, prime sponsors were required to submit an annual comprehensive manpower plan to the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. This comprehensive plan was expected to include a listing of the target groups for the delivery of employment and training services, a description and justification of the types of services to be delivered to participants, and the expected outcomes of these activities, including the planned numbers of individuals to be entering unsubsidized employment upon their termination from the local CETA system.[11]

In their annual plans for CETA Title I programs,[12] prime sponsors were required to describe the characteristics of their resident labor force, including the unemployed, underemployed, and the economically disadvantaged.[13] The annual plan was to include estimates of selected demographic characteristics of the local unemployed population (age, sex, and race) as well as the planned relative level of services to each of those demographic groups.[14] Section 105 (a) (1) of the 1973 CETA Act had called upon prime sponsors to provide assurances to the Secretary of Labor that employment and training services would be provided to those individuals "most in need of them," with particular emphasis upon persons living in low income families and households and individuals with limited English-speaking ability. As a result, in determining the planned level of Title I services to various demographic groups, prime sponsors were allowed to deviate from the estimated distribution of unemployment in various demographic groups if the groups selected to receive higher levels of services were shown to contain above average shares of economically disadvantaged or underemployed persons.[15] The rules and regulations governing CETA Title II programs also noted that in selecting target groups, prime sponsors should give special consideration to various veterans groups, welfare recipients, and former manpower enrollees in need of further employment and training services.[16]

In planning the mix of services under its Title I programs (i.e., institutional training, on-the-job training, work experience, and public service employment), prime sponsors were asked to analyze current and projected economic conditions in their local areas, including overall levels of unemployment and available job opportunities.[17] In planning their classroom training activities, prime sponsors were required to provide assurances that all of their occupationally-oriented classroom training activities would be geared to occupational shortage areas that offered program participants "reasonable expectations of employment."[18] In preparing their annual Title I plans, prime sponsors were supposed to list occupational areas currently in shortage and provide an explanation for the existence of such shortages, including a lack of available skilled workers in a growing occupation, low wages, and high turnover of workers in the occupation.[19] Neither the CETA legislation nor the rules and regulations attempted to provide definitions of "occupational shortages."[20] Recognizing the lack of comprehensive job vacancy data at the state and local level to assist prime sponsor planners in identifying occupational shortage areas, the Employment and Training Administration in the rules and regulations for Title I programs simply instructed CETA planners to consult with local offices of the State Employment Security Agencies and the National Alliance of Businessmen to determine occupational areas in which shortages may exist.[21]

The 1973 CETA legislation and the rules and regulations placed other requirements and restrictions on CETA prime sponsors in the planning of training activities under Title I programs. First, the Act placed certain limitations on the maximum duration of training activities under Title I. Training allowances could not be paid to participants enrolled in training courses whose duration was in excess of 104 weeks.[22] Second, the Act stated that no participants could be referred to training activities for jobs that typically required less than two weeks of pre-employment training unless it could be shown that immediate employment opportunities in this skills area were available.[23] In addition, the Act also prohibited prime sponsors from training in occupations where no substantive specific skills were required for entry level training and where wages were low and voluntary turnover was high.[24] Third, in selecting service delivery agents for the provision of training services, prime sponsors were to consider utilizing the facilities of existing Federal, state, and local government agencies, with proven program effectives including vocational education and vocational rehabilitation agencies, and were to give a priority to the use of existing MDTA skills centers in providing classroom training.[25] Finally, Section 105 (a) (6) of the Act stated that both classroom and OJT training activities under Title I should lead to unsubsidized employment for participants providing "economic self-sufficiency." Neither the Act nor the rules and regulations provided definitions of the concept of "economic self-sufficiency." Analysts of CETA programs and prime sponsor planners and directors have interpreted this concept in a number of alternative ways, including that of increased earned incomes for participants, the attainment of earned incomes for participants above the OMB poverty line, and the reduced reliance of participants upon public assistance payments for their basic support.[26]

Title II programs under the 1973 CETA legislation were intended to provide unemployed and underemployed persons residing in areas of substantial unemployment with public service job opportunities.[27] These public service jobs were to be designed to meet the public service needs of the community and participants in these programs were to be given training and other employability services to enable them to successfully move either into unsubsidized employment or into training activities not funded under the Act upon their termination from the program.[28]

In preparing their annual plans for Title II programs, prime sponsors were required to provide data on the number of residents eligible for participation in such programs, including information on their family or household income status and their current employment status.[29] The above information was intended to be used by prime sponsors to guarantee an allocation of employment opportunities under the act among demographic groups in accord with their relative degree of representation in the eligible population. The Act, however, also required prime sponsors to provide assurances that they would give special consideration to the long-term unemployed and to those eligible applicants whose prospects for obtaining unsubsidized employment in the absence of services under the Act were least promising.[30] As noted above, prime sponsors were also asked to place special emphasis in the selection of Title II program participants upon disabled veterans, Vietnam-era veterans under 35 years of age, welfare recipients, and former manpower training program participants unable to secure unsubsidized employment.

The employment opportunities provided to participants in Title II programs were intended to be viewed as transitional in nature. The 1973 CETA Act and the rules and regulations contained a number of provisions and planning requirements designed to increase the likelihood that Title II participants would be able to make a successful transition into unsubsidized employment in either the private or public sector upon their termination from the local CETA system. First, Section 105 (a) (2) of the Act called upon prime sponsors to provide assurances that their Title II services would be integrated with those provided under their Title I programs to increase the probability that participants would be able to secure unsubsidized employment upon termination. Second, prime sponsors were to make good faith efforts to guarantee that jobs created under Title II were not "dead end," but rather would assist in enhancing the long-term employability potential of participants.[31] Third, prime sponsors were to provide assurances that they would attempt to develop PSE job opportunities under Title II programs that would provide participants with skills that have a projected high demand and that are in occupational areas characterized by favorable projected employment opportunities.[32] In submitting their annual plans for Title II programs, prime sponsors were required to submit a PSE Occupational Summary listing the occupational titles and wages of the PSE jobs to be created during the forthcoming fiscal year.[33] The occupational distribution of these PSE jobs could have been compared to the findings of the state and local occupational projections programs of the SESA's to determine whether Title II PSE jobs were in fact being developed in occupational areas characterized by relatively favorable employment outlooks.[34]

The Role of Prime Sponsor Planning Councils, State Manpower Services Councils, and the Regional ETA Offices in Reviewing and Approving Prime Sponsor Plans

Section 104 of the 1973 CETA Act mandated the creation of Prime Sponsor Planning Councils. The members of this planning council were to include representatives of the client community, community-based organizations, the state employment service, other employment and training agencies, the local business community, organized labor, and, where relevant, agriculture. The members and chairperson of this council were to be appointed by the prime sponsor.

The official roles and responsibilities of the planning council included that of making recommendations to the prime sponsor with respect to overall goals and policies of the local CETA system, reviewing prime sponsor plans and program activities, monitoring and evaluating the employment and training programs of the prime sponsor, and conducting analyses of the continuing needs of planning area residents for employment and training services.[35] The rules and regulations indicated quite clearly, however, that the function of the planning council was purely an advisory one and that:

> The Council's advisory authority does not free the prime sponsor from its final decisionmaking authority under the Act. 36

The 1973 CETA Act required state prime sponsors to establish a State Manpower Services Council as well as a Prime Sponsor Planning Council.[37] The membership of this council was to include representatives of prime sponsors, the state vocational education agency, the State Employment Security Agency, the business community, organized labor, the CETA client community, and community-based organizations. The members and chairperson of the State Manpower Services Council were to be appointed by the Governor of the state.

The State Manpower Services Council was expected to assume a number of different responsibilities. Among these were reviewing the annual plans of all prime sponsors throughout the state; making recommendations to prime sponsors and state agencies involved in providing services to prime sponsors on means for more effectively coordinating the delivery of employment and training services throughout the state; monitoring prime sponsor program operations on a continuous basis; and making recommendations to the Governor, prime sponsors, and state agencies involved in providing services to prime sponsors on methods for increasing the future effectiveness of their programs.[38] As was true of the CETA prime sponsor planning councils, the Services Councils were also strictly advisory in nature.

As a result of the passage of Public Law 94-482: The Education Amendments of 1976, the State Manpower Services Councils (SMSC) were required to link their activities more closely with those of State Vocational-Technical Education Advisory Councils.[39] Governors were mandated to appoint a member of the SMSC to represent that body on the State Vocational-Technical Education Advisory Council, and a member of the Advisory Council was to be given representation on the SMSC.[40] Public Law 94-482 also called upon the SMSC to consult with the State Vocational-Technical Education Advisory Council in analyzing the skills training needs of the state and in assessing the extent to which the state's existing employment and training system represented "a consistent, integrated, and coordinated approach to meeting such (skill) needs."[41]

Prior to submitting their annual grant application to the Regional Administrator of the Manpower Administration (now the Employment and Training Administration), CETA prime sponsors were required to make their grant applications available for 30 days to the governors and to the general public for their comments and review.[42] After this 30-day period, the plans for Title I and Title II programs were then forwarded to the regional office of the Employment and Training Administration for review and approval. The annual plans of prime sponsors were assessed by regional office staff to determine whether they met all of the planning requirements spelled out under Sections 105, 106, and 205 of the Act as well as the rules and regulations governing programs operated under Titles I and II.[43]

The formal approval of a prime sponsor's grant application was also dependent on the determination of the Regional Administrator that the prime sponsor had made "maximum efforts" to achieve the goals that it had established in its previous year's plan.[44] Modifications to the annual Title I and Title II plans of prime sponsors frequently occur during the year. Prime sponsors are, however, required to obtain the prior approval of the Regional Office of ETA for plan modifications that involve substantive changes in such areas as program goals, the design of programs, and the planned number of individuals to be enrolled or terminated from program activities during the year.[45]

The CETA Prime Sponsor Planning Process Under the 1978 CETA Amendments

As revealed in Chapter 1 of this report, the 1978 CETA Amendments contained a number of key provisions affecting the overall goals of CETA programs, the targeting of CETA resources, and the planning of CETA programs. The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion of the influences of the 1978 CETA Amendments and the accompanying rules and regulations upon the prime sponsor planning process.[46] Major emphasis will be placed upon the development of the master plan and the annual plans for programs under various CETA titles and the roles and responsibilities of the various local planning and advisory councils mandated by the 1978 legislation, particularly the Private Industry Councils under the new Title VII programs.

To receive financial assistance under the Act, CETA prime sponsors are required to submit a Comprehensive Employment and Training Plan consisting of two separate parts, a master plan and an annual plan. The Act viewed the master plan as "the long-term charter under which the programs of the prime sponsor shall be operated."[47] The prime sponsor's master plan would be required to be updated each year to reflect any substantive changes in local program goals, administrative arrangements, and overall economic conditions in the local area. Major emphasis in the development of the master plan was to be placed upon an overall description of the demographic characteristics (age, sex, race) of various significant segments and a detailed description of general economic trends and occupational employment developments in the local area. The information provided in the master plans was to be used by the regional offices of ETA to assess the appropriateness of the planned program activities presented by prime sponsors in their annual plans, particularly in terms of their relationship to the economic conditions in the area.

The master plan of the prime sponsor was to include data on the general characteristics of the population in the geographic areas served by the prime sponsor, the demographic characteristics of a number of key target groups for the delivery of employment and training services, and the number of potential eligible participants, including information on their employment and income characteristics.[48] The instructions for drafting the master plan that were contained in the Forms Preparation Handbook called upon prime sponsors to provide information on the demographic characteristics (sex, age, racial/ethnic) of the general population, the population potentially eligible for CETA services, the long-term unemployed (i.e., unemployed 15 or more consecutive weeks), persons residing in households with incomes below the OMB poverty level, and persons living in households receiving AFDC benefits or other state or local public assistance payments.[49] The instructions appearing in the Forms Preparation Handbook indicated that, in providing the above information, prime sponsors should use the best available data, but encouraged prime sponsors to collect more detailed information on the local CETA eligible population.

In addition to providing the data on the demographic characteristics of the above five groups, the Act also called upon prime sponsors to provide a description in their master plan of procedures that they would adopt to ensure that employment and training services would be delivered to those "most in need of them," with particular emphasis on low-income persons, older workers, individuals with limited English-speaking ability, and the handicapped.[50] The rules and regulations also required prime sponsors to describe in their master plan the specific criteria that they would utilize in determining local priorities for the delivery of employment and training services to various CETA-eligible groups.[51]

In developing their master plans, prime sponsors were also required to provide a detailed assessment of current and projected employment opportunities by industry and occupation in their area and to describe their long-term goals with respect to improving economic and labor market conditions in their area. Section 103 (a) (1) (B) of the Act called upon CETA prime sponsors to undertake a

> comprehensive labor market analysis and assessment of the economic conditions in the area, identifying the availability of employment and training in various public and private labor market sectors in such areas and the potential for job growth in such sectors. 52

The Forms Preparation Handbook provided more detailed instructions to prime sponsors for undertaking the analysis and assessment of economic and labor market conditions. Prime sponsors were instructed to list their major local industries and the dominant occupations within each of those industries, with separate breakouts for the public and private sectors of the local economy. For each of these industry/occupation job combinations, prime sponsor planners were asked to provide data on each of the following six variables: "Current Availability of Labor," "Current Demand of Labor," "Estimated 5-Year Demand for Labor," "Estimated 5-Year Supply of Labor," "Current Availability of Pre-Employment Training," and "Current Availability of Non-CETA Employer or Union Training."[53] The concepts of "Availability," "Demand," and "Supply" were not defined in the Forms Preparation Handbook.[54] Prime Sponsors were instructed to use existing data sources in undertaking this analysis of the current and projected "demand" and "supply" of labor and available training opportunities.

In their master plans, prime sponsors were also asked to provide information on firm hiring standards and practices for particular occupations in the local area. In particular, they were requested to describe the types of educational abilities, specific vocational skills, attitudes, and other traits that the unemployed must possess to be able to be hired for jobs in career areas characterized by favorable future employment opportunities.[55]

Finally, prime sponsors were also required to provide information in their master plans on their practices and procedures for selecting service delivery agents. Prime sponsors were requested to describe the practices that they would adopt to obtain the involvement of educational agencies and community-based organizations in planning and operating programs under the Act; to outline the methods that they would utilize in selecting service delivery agents from an inventory of potentially available deliverers of service; to describe arrangements that they would make in using the services of existing Federal, state, and local educational employment and training agencies; and to spell out the methods that they would utilize to guarantee the "fullest possible utilization" of public vocational education facilities and those of local educational agencies.[56]

The 1978 CETA Amendments as well as the rules and regulations for CETA program operations developed by the U.S. Department of Labor also placed substantial planning requirements upon prime sponsors and the Private Industry Councils in developing their annual CETA plans. To successfully fulfill these planning requirements, prime sponsors must have access to detailed and timely data on the labor force and income characteristics of the resident population, overall employment and unemployment developments in the local labor area, and employment developments in specific local industries and occupations.

The eligibility criteria for participation in programs under various CETA Titles were defined in the Act itself and generally elaborated upon in the rules and regulations.[57] In developing their annual plans for programs under the various CETA Titles, prime sponsors are required to identify selected demographic characteristics (sex, age, racial/ethnic) of the local CETA-eligible population and to cite the planned relative level of services to members of each of those demographic subgroups within the CETA-eligible population.[58] Substantial variations between a demographic subgroup's estimated share of the eligible population and its planned share of services are to be justified in the annual plan by the prime sponsors.

In addition to the above data on the demographic characteristics of the eligible population and the planned share of services to demographic subgroups within the eligible population, prime sponsors are also requested to provide other information in their annual plans on the targeting of their employment and training services. For example, in their Title II B annual plans, prime sponsors are required to list the programs and services that would be provided to the following groups: youth, older workers, women, displaced homemakers, single parents, public assistance recipients, the handicapped, Vietnam-era veterans, offenders, persons of limited English-speaking ability, and persons in need of basic and remedial skills.[59] For their YETP and YCCIP youth programs, prime sponsors were asked to place particular emphasis on those youth groups within the eligible population "experiencing severe handicaps" in securing unsubsidized employment.[60]

Prime sponsors were also requested to provide information in their annual plans on the types of programs and services that they would offer to participants and to assess the expected effects of such services on various participant outcomes. In their Title II B annual plans, prime sponsors were to provide a listing of all occupational areas in which classroom training would be provided, to discuss how planned activities would lead to the career advancement and occupational mobility of participants, and to describe the skill acquisition opportunities available to participants that would lead to employment in nontraditional occupations.[61] In planning upgrading programs under Title II C, prime sponsors were required to outline the criteria that they had developed to select employers and occupations for participation in the upgrading program and to describe the types of training that would be provided to workers in entry-level jobs lacking upward mobility opportunities.[62]

Similar information on planned activities, including training services, was also requested of prime sponsors in their annual plans for public service employment programs financed under Title II D and VI of CETA. The 1978 CETA Amendments declared that the purpose of programs funded under Title II D of CETA is to "...provide economically disadvantaged persons who are unemployed with transitional employment in jobs providing needed public service..." with the aim of "... enabling such persons to move into employment or training not supported under this Act."[63] Given such program goals, the annual Title II D plans of prime sponsors are required to include information on the methods that will be employed to assure that participants will be able to obtain unsubsidized jobs, including the provision of training and services designed to facilitate participants' placement in unsubsidized jobs.[64]

In addition to the above information on activities designed to enhance Title II D programs' abilities to place terminees into unsubsidized employment, the annual plans must also include a "PSE Occupational Summary" that will indicate the types of positions planned to be created with Title II D funds during the forthcoming fiscal year.[65] Given such information, it would be possible for the regional ETA office to assess the extent to which the planned occupational distribution of Title II D PSE positions conformed to the distribution of the projected high growth or high net demand occupations identified in the prime sponsor's master plan.

Public service jobs funded under Title VI of CETA are "to the extent feasible...to be provided in occupational fields which are most likely to expand."[66] Consequently, the annual plans of prime sponsors submitted under this Title are required to describe..."the arrangements for the provision of training and services that will assist participants in obtaining unsubsidized employment."[67] A "PSE Occupational Summary" is also to be provided by prime sponsors in their annual plan. Again this information could be used by the regional offices of ETA for comparing the occupational areas identified in the master plan as likely to provide for placement of terminees in unsubsidized employment with the planned occupational distribution of Title VI PSE positions.[68]

In our earlier discussions of the development of the prime sponsor master plan, it was noted that among the information to develop this plan was that of data on "labor shortage occupations in the private sector." The instructions for the preparation of the annual Title VII plan also included a requirement that such shortage occupations be identified within the annual plan.[69] According to the rules and regulations governing Title VII programs, the statement of the objectives of the program as well as the need for funding under Title VII was to be based at least in part upon the identification of such shortage occupations.[70] In addition to the identification of such shortage occupations, PIC's are also required to "analyze private sector job opportunities including estimates by occupations, industry, and location."[71] This demand side analysis was primarily intended to provide a basis for the development of "projections of short- and long-range labor needs...that could be used...to refine employment and training programming so that it becomes increasingly responsive to private sector labor needs."[72]

The PIC's and prime sponsors are also asked to include within their annual Title VII plan "procedures and standards to be used for the selection of occupations in which training is to be provided" (again within the context of identified shortage occupations).[73] Additionally, PIC's are asked to establish training standards, such as course curricula and/or minimum achievement levels for participants, for programs operated under Title VII.[74]

Finally, the rules and regulations governing Title VII programs require a description of the ways in which PSIP programs will be monitored and evaluated. In this section of the annual plan, prime sponsors were required to include a statement of the role of the PIC in reviewing and assessing the performance of PSIP activities.[75]

Measuring Prime Sponsor Program Performance; Prime Sponsor Evaluation Efforts

The 1978 CETA Amendments contained a number of provisions related to prime sponsors reporting on the outcomes of their training programs, incentives for prime sponsor program evaluation, and the use of local program evaluation findings in the development of the annual plans. First, Section 313 (g) (1) (A) of the Act called upon the Secretary of Labor to "develop standard definitions of 'enrollments', 'completions', 'job placements', and 'training-related job placements' for classroom and on-the-job training programs funded under this Act." In addition, the Act called upon the Secretary to develop methods that would allow prime sponsors to uniformly report data on the numbers and occupational characteristics of jobs obtained by terminees from CETA-funded classroom and on-the-job training programs.[76] Information on the occupational characteristics and training-relatedness of jobs obtained by participants in such CETA training activities was not previously provided to the Employment and Training Administration by prime sponsors in their quarterly reports on enrollment, termination, and placement activities.

Second, Section 316(a) of the Act was designed to provide incentives for prime sponsors to volunteer to have their Title II program activities evaluated to determine their net effects on such outcomes as placement and retention of participants in unsubsidized employment and the earnings of Title II participants during some given follow-up period. Financial awards would be provided to those CETA prime sponsors whose Title II programs were discovered to "have performed well."[77]

Third, the Act and the rules and regulations called upon prime sponsors to present information on past program performance in their annual plans. For example, prime sponsors were requested to provide information in their annual plans on the current performance of their training programs, including data on the percentage of terminations that were positive in nature; i.e., entered unsubsidized employment or enrolled in another educational or training program not funded under the Act.[78] Section 103(b)(14) of the Act called upon prime sponsors to provide in their annual plans an overview of the findings of evaluations of its programs that had been undertaken in previous years and to describe how the findings of those evaluations had been used to alter the content of the prime sponsor's existing program or its current mix of services.[79]

The Planning Roles and Responsibilities of Prime Sponsor Planning Councils; The Roles of the State Employment and Training Councils and the Regional Offices of ETA

Currently, prime sponsors are mandated to create and utilize the services of three separate planning and advisory councils. These councils are the Prime Sponsor Planning Council, the Youth Planning Council, and the Private Industry Council (PIC). The respective roles and responsibilities of these three councils in planning, reviewing, and evaluating CETA program activities are described in more detail below.[81]

The Prime Sponsor Planning Councils (PSPC) continue to be mandated under the 1978 CETA Amendments. The membership of the PSPC's has been broadened somewhat since the passage of the 1973 CETA legislation to include representatives of unorganized workers, the handicapped, vocational education agencies, and state or local public assistance agencies. The official roles and responsibilities of the Prime Sponsor Planning Councils are quite similar to those that were assigned in the 1973 CETA Act. A few additional responsibilities of the Prime Sponsor Planning Councils are quite similar to those that were assigned in the 1973 CETA Act. A few additional responsibilities have been given to the PSPC, including their active participation in the development of the master plans of prime sponsors, the review of the Title IV Youth Program plans of the prime sponsor, and consultation with the membership of the Private Industry Council in the development of recommendations for prime sponsor policies and programs.[82]

Among the provisions of the Youth Employment and Demonstrations Project Act of 1977 was the mandate that prime sponsors desiring funding for YETP and YCCIP programs establish a Youth Planning Council.[83] The Youth Planning Council was to include representatives of local educational agencies, local vocational/technical education advisory councils, postsecondary educational institutions, local businesses, organized labor, the State Employment Security Agency, local youth service agencies, and youths themselves. The Youth Planning Council was expected "at a minimum (to) make recommendations to the planning council" with respect to the planning and administration of YETP and YCCIP programs.[84] It was also expected to review the agreement that the prime sponsor had developed with the local educational agency for the provision of employment and training services to in-school youth under YETP programs.[85]

The 1978 CETA Amendments continued to mandate prime sponsors to create Youth Planning Councils under their Prime Sponsor Planning Councils.[86] Their roles and responsibilities remain the same as those under the 1977 YEDPA legislation, and their function remains an advisory one to the Prime Sponsor Planning Council and to the prime sponsor itself.[87]

The Private Industry Council

As noted earlier, the 1978 CETA Amendments included a new Title (VII) creating the Private Sector Initiatives Program (PSIP). This program was intended to be a demonstration program whose primary purposes included that of more effectively linking the CETA employment and training system to private sector needs as well as incorporating the expertise and insights of the private sector into the overall CETA planning process. The overall goals of the PSIP legislation were twofold: To demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative methods of involving the private sector in CETA-related employment and training activities and to increase employment opportunities for the economically disadvantaged population in the private sector.[88] As the basic mechanism for achieving these goals, the legislation called for the establishment of Private Industry Councils (PIC's) within Prime Sponsor Jurisdictions.[89] These Councils were to be primarily composed of representatives from the private-for-profit business community. Such representatives were to hold at least one-half of the seats on the PIC. Additional representatives of organized labor, community-based organizations, and educational agencies are also to serve on the council.[90] Under the legislation, the PIC's are required to be heavily involved in the planning, design, and operation of programs under Title VII. Programs operated under Title VII are to be jointly developed and approved by both the prime sponsor and the PIC.[91] Unlike other prime sponsor advisory councils, PIC's appear to have substantial and direct control over the contents of the final Title VII plan submitted by the prime sponsor to the Regional Office of the U.S. Department of Labor since ETA regional offices cannot accept a Title VII plan that does not include PIC approval. Additionally, upon mutual agreement between the prime sponsor and the council, PIC's may incorporate themselves, such that Title VII funds can be transferred to PIC's, who, with the approval of the prime sponsor, may plan, design, and operate their own Title VII employment and training programs.

The legislation, however, did not limit the purview of PIC's only to Title VII programs. The legislation declared that:

> Such Council shall participate with the prime sponsor in the development and implementation of programs under this title, and shall consult with the prime sponsor with respect to other programs under this Act. [92]

In short, programmatic responsibilities under Title VII are shared by the prime sponsor and the PIC while the PIC, in addition, acts as an advisory body to the prime sponsors for programs under all other CETA titles. In developing and administering Title VII programs, PIC's were asked by the Congress to engage in a wide variety of activities related to the planning, implementation, operation, and evaluation of PSIP programs. PIC's are expected to seek ways for improving the coordination of the activities of major local labor market actors, including CETA, local education agencies, local economic development agencies and the private sector.[93] They are also expected to attempt to develop viable working relationships with local employers upon whom to base marketing strategies for a wide variety of employment and training services, including Targeted Jobs Tax Credits, worker up-grading, on-the-job training, apprenticeship positions, and a small business internship program.[94] Finally, within the PSIP legislation, Congress mandated that PIC's be actively engaged in the planning and design of Title VII programs, particularly by providing local labor market information for planning purposes. Specifically, PIC's were charged with the task of "encouraging employers to develop job skill requirement forecasts and to coordinate such forecasts with prime sponsors."[95] The legislation requires that estimates of job opportunities by occupation, industry, and location be developed by the PIC. PIC's are also called upon by the Congress to develop criteria for selecting occupational areas for training and to provide standards and specifications for training programs within an occupational area, including the development of training program course curricula.[96]

The CETA Title VII legislation has clearly delegated major responsibilities to PIC's that place an additional emphasis upon the development and use of labor market and occupational information within the CETA prime sponsor planning process. During the past six months, issues related to the identification of local employer needs and the design of employment and training strategies to meet such needs have been continuously addressed by local PIC members, PIC staff, and CETA prime sponsor planning staffs throughout the nation. In the foreseeable future, it appears that such efforts will likely intensify. If, as is anticipated, PIC's continue to expand their efforts to identify local employer needs through the use of locally-designed, employer-based surveys, efforts should be undertaken to integrate such data collection activities with on-going efforts to develop national and state comprehensive occupational information systems.

The National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC) and the network of SOICC's should make substantive efforts to coordinate the activities of the Employment and Training Administration, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, research departments of State Employment Security Agencies, and those responsible for identification of employer needs within local CETA prime sponsor systems. Through such coordination, the local data users, such as CETA prime sponsors and vocational education agencies, could more effectively utilize existing sources of labor market and occupational information to their fullest capacity. In addition to avoiding overlap and duplication in data collection activities between Federal/State cooperative programs and prime sponsor employer surveys, such coordination would permit prime sponsors to target their employer surveys to areas that would assist in the development of specific types of labor market and occupational information that are not currently produced under existing statistical programs, such as knowledge of local employer hiring standards and practices for selected entry-level jobs.

A second major coordinative task in the area of local employer surveys must also be undertaken by the NOICC and SOICC's. The legislation creating the NOICC and SOICC system mandated the development of an occupational information system that is..."based on uniform definitions, standardized estimating procedures and standardized occupational classifications..."[97] Employer surveys conducted by prime sponsors to date have relied upon a wide variety of data collection methodologies, definitions of labor market concepts, and estimation techniques. Consequently, little comparability exists among prime sponsors with respect to the characteristics of the data produced under their current employer surveys. Clearly, a role exists for both the NOICC and SOICCs to coordinate these data collection efforts among prime sponsors. Such coordinative efforts would most profitably focus upon developing agreements among prime sponsors with respect to the design of future employer surveys and the use of appropriate basic survey concepts and techniques. In addition, the NOICC and SOICC organizations should also attempt to foster relationships between prime sponsor and SESA research staff so that basic data inputs required for the development of employer surveys by prime sponsors would become more readily accessible to their planning staffs.

State Employment and Training Councils

States requesting CETA funds from the U.S. Department of Labor are required to form a State Employment and Training Council (SETC).[98] These state advisory councils have taken the place of the State Manpower Services Councils created by the 1973 CETA Act. The membership, roles, and responsibilities of the SETC's are quite similar to those of the State Manpower Services Councils. A few differences in membership, roles, and responsibilities between the two organizations do, however, exist.

First, the number of groups for whom membership on the SETC was mandated by the Congress has been increased. Representatives of state public assistance agencies and the handicapped population are to be provided membership on the SETC. The proportionate shares of membership allocated to the various mandated groups of representatives were also altered under the 1978 CETA Amendments.[99]

Second, in addition to reviewing the annual plans of prime sponsors, recommending ways for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of employment and training programs operated by prime sponsors and other state agencies, and identifying the continuing employment and training needs of the state, the SETC was also expected to assist in the development of the Governor's Coordination and Special Services Plan. This plan, required of all states requesting funding under the 1978 CETA Amendments Act, was expected to outline state efforts to promote the planning of CETA programs on the basis of economic and employment developments in entire labor areas, to develop and make available to prime sponsors information on state and local economic and employment conditions, to provide prime sponsors and local educational agencies with labor market and occupational information for use in the planning of their programs, and to support the activities of State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees.[100] As was true of the State Manpower Services Councils, the SETC's functions are purely advisory in nature.

The Plan Review and Approval Roles of the Regional Offices of ETA

Prior to submitting its master and annual plans to the regional office of the Employment and Training Administration, a prime sponsor must forward them to the Governor, the State Employment and Training Council (SETC), the Prime Sponsor Planning Council (PSPC), the Private Industry Council (PIC), and appropriate local labor organizations for their review and comment.[101] The prime sponsor is also required to provide notice of the availability of the plan to the state legislature, selected community-based organizations, appropriate educational agencies, and the general public. The comments and recommendations submitted by the above parties are to be given consideration by the prime sponsor prior to forwarding its plan to the Regional Administrator of ETA for review and approval. Copies of the comments and recommendations provided to the prime sponsor by the Governor, the SETC, and the PSPC are to be forwarded together with the annual plan to the Regional Administrator.[102]

The regional offices of ETA are required to review the annual plans of prime sponsors to determine their overall completeness and their compliance with the legislative requirements and the rules and regulations. In reviewing these plans, the regional offices of ETA are expected to determine the extent to which the prime sponsor has included a proper description and analysis of labor market conditions in its area and to assess whether the planned program activities of the prime sponsor are appropriate given the economic and labor market conditions prevailing in the local area.[103]

Before approving the plan, the regional offices of ETA are required to review the adequacy of the planned performance goals of the prime sponsor. The Regional Administrator must also make a determination, based on past program performance and the comments submitted by the Governor and the PSPC and SETC advisory councils, as to whether the prime sponsor is capable of administering an effective set of employment and training programs.[104] The Regional Administrator may require the prime sponsor to make modifications in its annual plan to bring it into compliance with the CETA law, rules, and regulations, to increase the efficiency with which local programs are managed and administered, and/or to enhance the effectiveness of local programs in achieving the goals of the Act. The Regional Administrator may also disapprove a portion or all of a prime sponsor's plan if it is determined that the use of monies for such disapproved activities would "fail to carry out the purposes of this Act."[105]

Chapter 2: Footnotes

1. See: i) 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, "Section 102;"

   ii) U.S. Department of Labor, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Compilation of Current Regulations for Titles I, II, and VI," Federal Register, October 18, 1977, Part III, p. 55735-55736.

   The eligibility criteria for prime sponsorship under the 1978 CETA Amendments can be found in the following two publicatins:

   i) 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 101;"

   ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations: Final Rule," Federal Register, April 3, 1979, pp. 20003-20004.

2. The eligibility criterion for receipt of funds under Title II programs of the 1973 CETA Act was the same as that for Title I programs except that it allowed Indian tribes located on Federal or state reservations and characterized by areas of substantial unemployment (an unemployment rate greater than or equal to 6.5 percent for three continuous months) to also apply for prime sponsorship of such programs.

   See: 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, "Section 204."

3. These 473 CETA prime sponsors represented an increase of 13 over the number of operating programs during FY 1979.

   See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, ETA Interchange, Vol. V, No. 10, October 1979, pp. 1-3.

4. For a review of the factors influencing the breakup of CETA prime sponsor consortia during the early years of operations,

   See: Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, CETA: Manpower Programs under Local Control, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1978, pp. 83-116.

5. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, ETA Interchange, Vol. V, No. 10, October 1979, p. 1.

The instructions for preparing preapplications for FY 81 CETA sponsorship as well as a listing of state and local government jurisdictions eligible for prime sponsorship were recently released by the Employment and Training Administration.

See: "FY 1981 Preapplication Details Issued" and "Instructions on CETA Preapplications and Lists of Jurisdictions Eligible to Be Prime Sponsors," Employment and Training Reporter, Volume 11, Number 17, January 9, 1980, pp. 480-486-489.

6. The issue of the appropriate geographic area upon which to base planning decisions has also been frequently raised in the planning of public vocational education programs. Some vocational administrators have argued that occupational employment data for planning purposes should be based upon multi-labor market areas, including areas in contiguous states. Analysts of the vocational education system have suggested that in certain instances the appropriate basis for planning vocational programs should be that of regional rather than state or local labor markets.

See: i) Drewes, D.W. and Katz, D.S., Manpower Data and Vocational Education: A National Study of Availability and Use, North Carolina State University, Center for Occupational Education, Raleigh, 1975.

ii) Lecht, Leonard A., Priorities for Planning in Vocational Education: Alternatives for the 1970's, National Planning Association, Washington, D.C., 1975.

7. Prime sponsors could also receive funding under Title III of CETA for administering employment and training programs for national target groups, including offenders, Native Americans, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and youth.

See: 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, "Title III - Special Federal Responsibilities," "Part A-Special Target Groups."

8. During FY 75, enrollments in public service employment activities under Title I programs accounted for approximately only 2.9 percent of total Title I enrollments.

See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1976, "Table F-4," p. 341.

9. See: U.S. Department of Labor, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Compilation of Current Regulations for Titles I, II, and VI," Federal Register, October 18, 1977, Part III.

10. See: 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, "Section 101."

11. Ibid., "Sections 105 and 106."

12. In addition to the annual plans for Title I and II programs, prime sponsors applying for financial assistance for the first time had to develop and submit to the Regional Administrator of ETA a Prime Sponsor Agreement (PSA). This agreement was to include a detailed statement of the overall purposes of the prime sponsor's programs, descriptions of overall economic conditions of the area, methods for recruiting and selecting participants, the prime sponsor planning process, the selection of service delivery agents, the organizational structure of the prime sponsor, the methods that would be used to control the administration of the system (monitoring, personnel, accounting, fiscal) and the prime sponsor's agreement to comply with general assurances required under the Act.

    See: U.S. Department of Labor, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Compilation of Current Regulations for Titles I, II, and VI," pp. 55738-55740.

13. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973: Forms Preparation Handbook, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975, pp. III-7.

14. The definitions of unemployment developed by the Employment and Training Administration for use by prime sponsors in determining eligibility of applicants for participation in CETA Title One and Two programs are different in several key respects from those used by the Bureau of the Census and the Bureau of Labor Statistics in conducting the Current Population Survey.

    See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Compilation of Current Regulations For Titles I, II, and VI," pp. 55732-33;

    ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Concepts and Methods Used in Labor Force Statistics Derived from the Current Population Survey, BLS Report No. 463, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

15. A justification was required for all demographic groups for whom the planned relative share of service deviated by more than 15 percent from its estimated share of the total number of unemployed.

    See: U.S. Department of Labor, Op. Cit., p. 55740.

16. Ibid., p. 55757.

17. Prime sponsors were required to make quarterly estimates of the planned number of cumulative and current enrollments in major program activities under Title I programs, including classroom training, on-the-job training, public service employment, work experience, and "other activities."

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973*: *Forms Preparation Handbook*, pp. III-25 to III-39.

18. *See*: 93rd U.S. Congress, *Public Law 93-203*: *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973*, "Section 105 (a) (6)," and "Section 603."

This concept of "reasonable expectations of employment" was originally applied to the selection of occupational areas for the training of the disadvantaged under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. For a more detailed discussion of this concept,

See: Mangum, Garth L. and Walsh, John F., *A Decade of Manpower Development and Training*, particularly pp. 87-118.

19. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973*: *Forms Preparation Handbook*, p. III-7.

20. For a review of alternative definitions of the concept of an occupational shortage,

See: i) Devine, Eugene, *Analysis of Manpower Shortages in Local Government*, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1970;

ii) Folk, Hugh, *The Shortages of Scientists and Engineers*, D.C. Heath and Co., Lexington, 1970;

iii) Stevens, David W., *Employment Projections for Planning Vocational-Technical Education Curricula*: *Mission Impossible?* Human Resources Research Program, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1976.

21. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, *Op. Cit*., p. 55744.

The job vacancy survey administered under the JOLTS program was discontinued in the late fall of 1973. For further details on the design, administration, and findings of this national job vacancy survey,

See: i) White, Sheila C., "Job Vacancy Survey," *Employment and Earnings*, September 1970, pp. 18-26;

ii) Armknecht, Paul A., "Job Vacancies in Manufacturing, 1969-73," *Monthly Labor Review*, August 1974, pp. 27-33.

22. *See*: 93rd U.S. Congress, *Public Law 93-203*, "Section III (a)."

23. *Ibid*., "Section 603."

24. *Ibid*., "Section 604."

25. *Ibid*., "Section 105 (a) (3)."

26. *See*:
    - i) King, Christopher; Harkins, William H.; and Geraci, Vincent J.; *CETA Title II Performance Measurement Issues*, Paper Presented to the U.S. Department of Labor Conference on CETA Title II Performance Indicators, Virginia, February 1980;
    - ii) Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis; Zornitsky, Jeffrey; *Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training Programs at the Local Level*; *Volume One*: *The Role of Program Evaluation*, particularly Chapter Two.

27. The concept of "underemployed" was briefly defined in the 1973 Act and expanded upon in the rules and regulations for CETA programs.

    See:
    - i) 93rd U.S. Congress, *Public Law 93-203*, "Section 601 (a) (12);"
    - ii) U.S. Department of Labor, *Op. Cit*., p. 55732.

28. The overall goals of Title II programs were spelled out by the Congress in Section 201 of the 1973 CETA Act.

29. *See*:
    - i) 93rd U.S. Congress, *Public Law 93-203*, "Section 205 (c) (2);"
    - ii) U.S. Department of Labor, *Op. Cit*., p. 55757.

30. *See*: 93rd U.S. Congress, *Public Law 93-203*, "Section 205 (c) (7)."

31. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, *Op. Cit*., p. 55755.

32. *See*: 93rd U.S. Congress, *Public Law 93-203*, "Section 205 (c) (4) and (c) (6)."

33. For a review of the format of the PSE Occupational Summary and the instructions for its completion,

    See: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973*: *Forms Preparation Handbook*, pp. III 41-III 43.

34. During this time period (1974-1977) the BLS/SESA occupational projections program was providing projections of 1985 industry and occupational employment levels and annual average job openings by occupation for each state and for major labor areas of the nation.

See: Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.: and Herrnstadt, Irwin; Issues in the Development of a Comprehensive Occupational Information System for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Paper Prepared for the Fifth Annual New England Business and Economic Development Conference, Wakefield Massachusetts, 1977.

35. See: 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203, "Section 104."

A review of the actual composition, roles, and activities of Prime Sponsor Planning Councils in a selected number of prime sponsor areas during the first few years of CETA operations can be found in the following three publications:

i) Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Impact on People, Places, and Programs, pp. 46-66.

ii) Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1978, pp. 47-82;

iii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Manpower Program Evaluation, "The Role of Planning Councils and Community Participation in the Planning Process, CETA Staff Evaluation Findings, 1975," unpublished paper.

36. U.S. Department of Labor, Op. Cit., p. 55737.

37. See: 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203, "Section 107."

38. For a more detailed overview of the activities of State Manpower Services Councils during the first few years of CETA program operations,

See: Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control, pp. 90-94.

39. For a more detailed discussion of some of the key features of the 1976 Education Amendments,

See: i) Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.: and Mazzeo, Katherine; An Introduction to the Role of Occupational Information Systems; The Objectives of the Labor Supply Study, A Paper Prepared for the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security's Occupation/Industry Research Department, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, 1978;

ii) LeCam, Christine, The Role of Institutional Supply Data in the Development of an Occupational Information System, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1979.

40. *See*: 94th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 94-482*: *The Education Amendments of 1976*, "Title Two, Section 105 (a)."

41. *Ibid*., "Title Two, Section 105 (d) (4) (A)."

42. Prime sponsors were also required to submit a summary of their grant applications for 30-day review by labor unions representing local workers in jobs similar to those which CETA participants would hold under subsidized employment or training activities under Title I and Title II programs.

    See: U.S. Department of Labor, *Op. Cit.*, p. 55741.

43. For an overview of the plan review and assessment process,

    See:
    - i) U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Manpower Report of the President: 1975*, pp. 90-92;
    - ii) U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Employment and Training Report of the President*: *1978*, pp. 44-45;
    - iii) Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, *CETA*: *Manpower Programs Under Local Control*, pp. 89-90.

44. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, *Op. Cit.*, p. 55742.

45. *Ibid*., p. 55742.

46. The rules and regulations for CETA programs under the 1978 CETA Amendments can be found in the following publication:

    U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," *Federal Register*, Tuesday, April 3, 1979.

47. 95th Congress, *Public Law 95-524*, Section 103 (a).

48. See: Ibid., "Section 103 (a) (1)."

The rules and regulations suggested that the data on significant segments and the CETA-eligible populations should be provided by prime sponsors if they were available.

49. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, p. II-7.

Efforts to develop estimates of the demographic characteristics of all CETA-eligible persons would be complicated by the fact that eligibility criteria vary across CETA Titles. Individuals eligible for participation in programs under one CETA Title; e.g., Title VI PSE, may well not be eligible for participation in programs under other CETA Titles, e.g. Title II B and Title II D programs that have more restrictive income eligibility criteria.

50. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 103 (a) (5) (A)."

51. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," p. 20006.

52. The rules and regulations stated that the analysis of labor market conditions and assessment of current and projected employment opportunities should be based upon existing data sources, particularly those available from the State Employment Security Agencies.

See: Ibid., p. 20006.

53. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, pp. II-9 to II-11.

54. For a detailed discussion of the concepts of employment, labor demand, labor supply, projected job openings, and available jobs,

See: Stevens, David. Op. Cit., particularly pp. 3-31.

55. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, pp. II-12 and II-13.

56. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 103 (a) (3)," "Section 103 (a) (6)," and "Section 103 (a) (13)."

57. The eligibility criteria for participation in Title II B, Title II C, Title II D, YETP, YCCIP, SPEDY, Title VI, and Title VII programs were spelled out in "Section 213," "Section 221(a)," "Section 236," "Section 435," "Section 422(3)," "Section 402," "Section 607," and "Section 701," respectively, of the 1978 CETA Amendments. The definitions of key

concepts used in determining participant eligibility appear in "Section 3" of the 1978 CETA Amendments.

58. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, pp. III-18, III-23, III-29, III-35, III-41, III-49, and III-55 for the planning formats for Title II B, II D, YCCIP, YETP, SYEP, Title VI, and Title VII programs, respectively. For Title II-C programs, prime sponsors are only asked to provide data on the planned percentage of enrollments in each demographic subgroup. Prime sponsors cannot at this point in time determine the characteristics of the eligible population for these programs given the lack of rigor in the existing eligibility criteria.

59. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 103(b)(3)."

60. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, pp. III-27 and III-37.

61. Ibid., p. III-14.

62. Ibid., p. III-21.

63. 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 231."

64. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Final Rule," Federal Register, April 3, 1979, p. 20045.

65. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, p. III-26.

66. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Final Rule," Federal Register, April 3, 1979, p. 20046.

67. Ibid., p. 20046.

68. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, p. III-52.

69. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, p. III-53.

70. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," Federal Register, Tuesday, April 3, 1979, p. 20051.

71. Ibid., p. 20051.

72. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations, Final Rule," *Federal Register*, Tuesday, April 3, 1979, p. 20050.

    The rules and regulations state that, in undertaking such an analysis, PIC's should employ information available in local economic development plans as well as data available from State Employment Security Agencies and Federal and State Apprenticeship agencies.

73. *Ibid*., p. 20051.

74. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Final Rule," *Federal Register*, April 3, 1979, p. 20050.

75. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Final Rule," April 3, 1979, p. 20051.

76. *See*: 95th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 95-524*, "Section 313 (g)(1)(B)."

    The Policy and Evaluation Division of the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development is currently involved in a pilot research effort designed to determine appropriate methods for and the feasibility of collecting such information on the occupational outputs of CETA classroom and OJT training activities. The research is being conducted under the auspices of the Massachusetts Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, with funding being provided by the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee.

77. *Ibid*., "Section 316 (b)."

    At the time of the writing of this report, criteria for judging the effectiveness of a CETA prime sponsor's program performance to implement the provisions of this section of the Act have not yet been developed by the National Office of the Employment and Training Administration.

78. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," p. 20007.

79. For an overview of the follow-up evaluation activities of CETA prime sponsors in the New England region,

    See: Sum, Andrew, "Follow-Up Evaluation Activities of New England CETA Prime Sponsors," A Paper Presented to the U.S. Department of Labor Conference on CETA Title II Performance Measures, Virginia, February, 1980.

80. The rules and regulations require the prime sponsors to discuss in its master plan the efforts that it will undertake to coordinate the activities of these three councils.

81. *See*: 95th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 95-524*, "Section 109."

82. *Ibid*., "Section 109 (e)," "Section 109 (f)," and "Section 436(a)(6)."

83. *See*: 95th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 95-93*: *Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977*, "Section 346(a)(6)."

84. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, "Youth Programs Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act," *Federal Register*, September 16, 1977, Part VI, p. 46735.

85. For a more detailed review of the activities of the Youth Planning Councils during the first two years of YEDPA programs operations,

    See: i) National Council on Employment Policy, *Initial Youth Employment and Demonstrations Projects Act (YEDPA) Experience at the Local Level*, (Report No. 1), Washington, D.C., February, 1978;

    ii) National Council on Employment Policy, *The Local Focus on Youth: A Review of Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstrations Projects Act* (Report No. 3 in a series), Washington, D.C., March 1979.

86. *See*: 95th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 95-942*, "Section 436(a)(7)."

87. *Ibid*., "Section 436(b)" and "Section 436(c)."

88. *See*: 95th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 95-524*: *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978*, "Section 701."

89. Multi-Jurisdictional PIC's are permitted and even encouraged under the CETA Amendments.

90. *See*: 95th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 95-524*: *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments*, "Section 704(a)(1)."

91. *Ibid*., "Section 703(B)(6)."

92. *Ibid*., "Section 703(B)(6)."

93. During the past several months, increasing attention has been paid to linking prime sponsor Title VII programs with local economic development programs. It appears that Congress may ask PIC's to link the local employment and training services mix to local economic development plans.

See: "Congress May Examine Ways to Require Ties Between 'PSIP' and Other Programs," Employment and Training Reporter, Volume II, Number 22, February 13, 1980, p. 629.

94. Particular emphasis is likely to be placed upon skill upgrading components within Title VII. Regulations are expected to be proposed by the Employment and Training Administration that would permit 6.5 percent of PSIP funding levels to be used for private sector skill upgrading. If CETA enrollees are placed in positions vacated as a result of upgrading, such funding levels could go up to 20 percent of the Title VII allocation.

See: "ETA May Propose Regulations Allowing PSIP Funds to be Used for Upgrading," Employment and Training Reporter, Volume II, Number 22, February 13, 1980.

95. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, "Section 705(a)(10)."

The above program activity was particularly emphasized by the Congress. Financial assistance to local prime sponsors under the Act is contingent upon the annual plan including a section in which the prime sponsor "describes its proposed private sector initiatives under this title and the integration of such initiatives with other training and placement activities under this act. The description shall include an analysis of private sector job opportunities, including estimates by occupation, industry, and location utilizing information provided by the Private Industry Council."

See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments, "Section 703 (a)" and "Section 703 (b)(3)."

96. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Final Rule," Federal Register, Tuesday, April 3, 1979, p. 20050.

97. See: 94th U.S. Congress, Public Law 94-482: Education Amendments of 1976, "Section 161 (b)(1)(B)."

98. For a review of the mandated membership, roles, and responsibilities of the State Employment and Training Councils,

See: i) 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 110;"

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Final Rule," Federal Register, April 3, 1979, pp. 20041-42

99. Under the 1978 CETA Amendments, one-fourth of the total membership of the SETC was to be allocated to representatives of units of general local government, including prime sponsors; business, labor, and agriculture; the client community and general public; and various service deliverers.

See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 110 (a)(3)."

100. See: Ibid., "Section 105 (b).

101. The annual plans of CETA prime sponsors must be made available to each of the above parties at least 45 days prior to their submission to the Regional Office. For a more detailed discussion of the plan review and approval process,

See: i) 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 104;"

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," Federal Register, April 3, 1979, pp. 20007-08.

102. The prime sponsor is also required to provide a justification for rejecting any of the recommendations made by its prime sponsor planning council.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," Federal Register, April 3, 1979, p. 20008.

103. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 104(c)(3)."

104. The formal assessment process used by ETA to rate the overall performance of prime sponsors and determine their eligibility for future funding is currently being strengthened by ETA. For a more detailed discussion of efforts to strengthen the assessment process,

See: "Program Assessment for FY 1980 Viewed as Bridge to Comprehensive System" and "General Instructions on FY 1980 Performance Assessment of Prime Sponsors," Employment and Training Reporter, Volume 11, Number 19, January 23, 1980, pp. 546, 563-64.

105. The prime sponsor must be given an opportunity to resolve the specific limitations of its plan that were identified by the regional office in the review process. If, however, the prime sponsor fails to provide appropriate remedies for such deficiencies within a reasonable time period (not less than 30 days), the plan will be disapproved.

See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 104(c)(3), (c)(4)."

Chapter 3

The Labor Force and Occupational Information Needs of CETA Prime Sponsors for Local Policymaking and Program Planning

Introduction

This chapter is primarily designed to provide an overview of the labor force and occupational information needs of CETA prime sponsors for local policymaking purposes and for planning, operating, and evaluating local employment and training programs. The information needs reviewed in this chapter will both modify and expand upon those currently required of CETA prime sponsors in the development of their master and annual plans. The emphasis of the discussions presented in this chapter will be upon the types of labor force and occupational information needed by CETA prime sponsors to allow them to undertake effective "strategic planning" and "tactical planning" rather than the "compliance planning" that has traditionally characterized the prime sponsor planning process.[1]

Strategic and tactical planning for the local CETA system are dependent upon the availability of rather detailed information on local residents eligible for and in need of employment and training services and labor market conditions within local labor areas.[2] This would include information on the characteristics of the local CETA-eligible population, the nature and causes of their employment and earnings problems, the numbers of current and projected employment opportunities by industry and occupation in local labor areas, and the occupational characteristics of those current and projected job opportunities. The latter informational requirements would include knowledge of their educational and training requirements, hourly and weekly wages, employment stability, and their links to higher level jobs within the firm and industry in which they are located.[3] Once specific programs have been implemented to achieve the goals and objectives of the local CETA system, additional industrial and occupational employment information on local growth industries, occupational staffing patterns of growth industries, and hiring activities of local firms in those industries is needed for job development and job placement purposes. Information on the termination status of participants (i.e., whether placed in an unsubsidized job, type of job obtained, etc.) and their longer-term labor force, employment and earnings experiences is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the local prime sponsor's delivery system in meeting its short-term and long-term goals and objectives.[4]

The lack of available, timely, and useful local labor force and occupational employment data has frequently been cited as a factor hindering the ability of CETA prime sponsors to undertake effective strategic and tactical planning.[5] While improvements in the availability and timeliness of local labor force and occupational employment data will not by themselves lead to more effective policymaking or program planning by prime sponsors, they are a prerequisite for improvements in the quality of the planning process.[6] The admonitions of Mangum and Walsh with respect to the need for such data are as relevant to the CETA system today as they were in 1973.

"If decentralization is to be a success, an improved system must be installed from the local level up for identifying the total universe of need, the kinds of services required by subgroups within that universe of need, and for collecting, synthesizing, storing, and disseminating labor market information - in a usable form - for a variety of users."[7]

Labor Force Information Needs

A summary of the labor force and earnings information needs of CETA prime sponsors for policymaking and program planning purposes is presented in table 3-1 on the following pages. Among the data requirements included in this table are data on the numbers and characteristics of the population, labor force, employed, unemployed, and economically disadvantaged. For each data category appearing in the table, information is presented on the desirable degree of geographic coverage, the desirable frequency of the availability of the data, the primary desired characteristics of the data, and other desirable characteristics of the data. It should be noted that "desired frequency of availability" does not imply "desired frequency of publication" in the sense of a formal published document containing the desired data elements. A substantial portion of the desired data elements could be made available to CETA prime sponsor planners by SESA's and other data producing agencies in the form of computer printouts containing specially-designed table formats useful for planning purposes.

Table 3-1: Population, Labor Force, Employment, Unemployment, and Income Data Needs of CETA Prime Sponsors for Policymaking and Program Planning

Type of Data	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Population Data	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors	Detailed data every five years; Annual updates of total population and selected population characteristics	Demographic characteristics of population (age, sex, race, marital status, household status); Socioeconomic characteristics of population (educational attainment, school enrollment status, household or family income status, public assistance status)	Veteran status, Handicapped status, Limited English-speaking ability
Labor Force Data	Prime sponsor area; subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors; State and local labor area	Monthly and annual average estimates of aggregate labor force; data on detailed characteristics of the labor force every five years; Annual updates of selected demographic characteristics of labor force participants	Demographic characteristics of labor force participation (age, sex, race, marital status, household status); Selected socioeconomic characteristics of labor force participants (educational attainment, school enrollment status, household or family income status)	Reasons for non participation in labor force; job desires of non-participants; perceived barriers to active labor force participation

Table 3-1: (continued)

Type of Data	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Employment Data	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors; State and local labor area	Monthly and annual average estimates of aggregate number of employed persons; Detailed characteristics of employed every five years; Annual updates of selected characteristics of the employed	Demographic characteristics of the employed (age, sex, race, marital status, household status); Selected socioeconomic characteristics of the employed (educational attainment, school enrollment status, household or family income status); occupation and industry of employment	Number of weekly hours of work; voluntary vs. involuntary nature of part-time employment
Unemployment Data	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsor; State and local labor area	Monthly and annual average estimates of aggregate number of unemployed persons; Detailed characteristics of unemployed every five years; Annual updates of characteristics of the unemployed	Demographic characteristics of the unemployed (age, sex, race, marital status, household status); Selected socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed (educational attainment, school enrollment status, household or family income status; Occupation and industry of last job attainment; Duration of current spell of unemployment	Reason for unemployment (job loser, leaver, new entrant, reentrant); Recall status of job loser

Table 3-1: (continued)

Type of Data	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Earnings and Income Data	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors; State and local labor area	Annual estimates of the annual average incomes of households and families; Detailed data on annual earnings of individuals, Annual incomes of various households and families and sources of income of households and families every five years	Annual earnings of workers in selected demographic and socioeconomic groups (sex, race, marital status, household status, educational attainment, previous training status); Annual earnings of workers in selected occupations and industries	Sources of annual earnings of selected groups of workers (weeks of employment, average hours of work per week, average hourly wages); Reasons for less than full-year of full-time employment
Data on the Economically Disadvantaged	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors; State and local labor area	Annual estimates of the total number and selected characteristics of the economically disadvantaged; Detailed data on the demographic, socioeconomic, and labor force characteristics of economically disadvantaged every five years	Demographic and selected socioeconomic characteristics of the economically disadvantaged (age, race, marital status, household status, educational attainment, school enrollment status); Labor force characteristics of the economically disadvantaged at time of survey; Labor Force and employment experiences and disadvantage in previous calendar year; Occupations and industries of employment in previous calendar year and at time of survey	Job desires of disadvantaged out of the labor force; Barriers to active labor force participation; reasons for part-time or part-year employment; veteran status, handicapped status; Limited-English speaking ability

The first major set of data required for CETA prime sponsor planning purposes is that of population data. Data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the resident population are needed to fulfill the planning requirements of the master plan and the annual plans for CETA programs.[8] Detailed data on the demographic (age, sex, race, marital status, household status)[9] and socioeconomic characteristics (educational attainment, household or family income status) of the resident population would only be required approximately every five years; however, it would be highly desirable for prime sponsors to obtain annual data on updated estimates of the overall size of the resident population and selected demographic characteristics of that population. The information on the veteran status, handicapped status, and language problems of residents appearing under Column D could be used together with other demographic data and data on the labor force and earnings status of these groups to identify the relative severity of the employment and income problems of the significant segments that are supposed to be given special consideration by prime sponsors in the delivery of services under their Title II programs.[10]

The population data described in table 3-1 would not only allow prime sponsors to fulfill basic CETA planning requirements, but could also be used by them to develop appropriate weights for inflating sample data generated by local household surveys to produce local population estimates and to serve as a base for measuring the relative severity of the unemployment, underemployment, and income problems of various demographic and socioeconomic groups in the prime sponsor's resident population.

The labor force data needs of CETA prime sponsors would best be met through the availability of such data on a prime sponsor basis as well as on a labor area and state basis. While not specifically required in the master and annual plans, the latter data would be useful to CETA prime sponsors for strategic planning purposes. Comparisons of the labor force participation behavior of residents of the prime sponsor planning area with those of all residents in the local labor area(s) and state would provide insights into potentially unique labor force problems of residents of the planning area; i.e., below average rates of labor force participation for particular age, sex, or racial/ethnic groups.[11]

Aggregate data on the civilian labor force in prime sponsor areas, local labor areas, and the states should be available on a monthly and annual average basis. Detailed data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of civilian labor force participants in the prime sponsor's planning area would only be needed approximately every five years. Annual estimates of the civilian labor force participation rates of selected age/sex/race groups in the prime sponsor's planning area would, however, be useful for preparing the annual CETA plans.

Additional data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of nonparticipants, their desires for jobs, and barriers to their active participation in the labor force would be highly useful to CETA prime sponsors in planning CETA Title Two programs. In the statement of purpose for CETA Title Two programs under the 1978 CETA reauthorization legislation, Congress declared that,

> It is the purpose of this title to etablish programs to provide comprehensive employment and training services throughout the Nation in order to ease barriers to labor force participation encountered by economically disadvantaged persons... [12]

To achieve the above objectives, CETA prime sponsor planners must have access to a data base that provides information on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of local residents who are not actively participating in the labor force and the reasons for their nonparticipation, including discouragement for economic or personal reasons.[13] It would also be highly desirable to have that same data base provide information on the actual job desires of nonparticipants, particularly the economically disadvantaged, the types of jobs, wages, and hours of work desired by these individuals, and their perceptions of the barriers to active labor force participation that they currently face.[14] Knowledge of the nature of the job desires of the economically disadvantaged and their perceived barriers to active labor force participation would be useful to CETA prime sponsor planners in designing the mix of services (basic educational services, skills training, job search training) to provide to economically disadvantaged participants in Title II programs and in determining the types of supportive services that they would need to participate fully in training and employment activities of the prime sponsor, including child care, transportation, and medical care.[15]

Aggregate data on the number of employed persons in prime sponsor planning areas, local labor areas, and states should be provided on a monthly and annual average basis. Detailed data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the employed population in the prime sponsor and local labor area should be available at least every five years. Annual estimates of selected demographic characteristics (age, sex, racial-ethnic) of the employed population in the prime sponsor planning area should also be made available. The annual data on estimated demographic characteristics of both the population and the employed in a prime sponsor area would allow for the calculation of annual average employment/population ratios, a useful measure of the overall labor market position of various demographic groups in the prime sponsor's planning area.[16]

In addition to the detailed data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the employed population in the prime sponsor's planning area, data on the occupational and industrial attachment of the employed population would also be desirable. Cross-tabulations of the data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the employed with the data on industrial and occupational attachment would provide useful insights into several key planning issues. First, data on the sex composition of the employed by occupation would allow for identification of potential occupational areas for training that would lead to the employment of CETA participants in nontraditional occupations.[17] Second, data on the occupational and industrial attachment of the employed economically disadvantaged population, particularly those employed year-round, would be useful in targeting efforts to upgrade workers under CETA Title II-C programs.

Data on the weekly hours of work of employed persons and the voluntary and involuntary nature of part-time employment would also be useful for CETA planning purposes.[18] First, under the definitions contained in the CETA legislation, persons employed involuntarily in part-time jobs (i.e., seeking full-time employment) are considered to be part of the underemployed, a key target group for the delivery of CETA-related employment and training services.[19] Knowledge of the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the underemployed is needed to properly target local CETA resources. Second, information on the occupational and industrial characteristics of the voluntary part-time employed would assist prime sponsors in identifying potential employment opportunities for those CETA-eligible persons whose age, health, or family responsibilities preclude their full-time participation in the labor force.[20] The master plans of CETA prime sponsors were supposed to include descriptions of their planned activities to provide part-time employment opportunities for the above mentioned CETA-eligible groups.[21]

Aggregate data on the number of unemployed persons in prime sponsor planning areas, local labor areas, and states should be provided on a monthly and annual average basis. The aggregate data on the number of persons in the civilian labor force and the number of unemployed could then be used to calculate monthly and annual average unemployment rates for each of the above areas.[22] The data on unemployment levels and rates for prime sponsor areas are needed not only to track changes in overall labor market conditions, but also to allocate available CETA monies among prime sponsor areas.[23]

Detailed data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed in prime sponsor and local labor areas would be needed at least every five years. These data are quite critical to CETA prime sponsors in the development of the master plan and in the targeting of CETA resources at the local level, particularly for the structurally-oriented programs under Title Two. Annual estimates of selected demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed in prime sponsor planning areas are needed to equitably allocate CETA monies among local CETA-eligible groups. Annual updates of selected characteristics of the unemployed are needed, given the fact that demographic characteristics of the unemployed are typically sensitive to overall changes in labor market conditions. As the aggregate unemployment rate declines, the composition of the unemployed at the national and state levels tends to shift toward teens and adult females (20+) and away from adult males (20+).[24]

In addition to the data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed in the prime sponsor's planning area, it would also be desirable for prime sponsor planners to have access to data on the durations of the unemployment spells of workers, the occupational and industrial attachment of the unemployed, and the reasons for unemployment (job loser, job leaver, new entrant, re-entrant). Data on the durations of unemployment spells would allow prime sponsor planners to identify the numbers and demographic characteristics of the long-term unemployed (15 or more weeks). The information on unemployment durations is needed in the development of the master plan and for use together with demographic and family income data in determining the numbers and demographic characteristics of individuals eligible for Title II D and VI PSE programs.[25] The data on the occupational and industrial attachment of the unemployed in local labor areas could potentially be used together with data on available job openings by industry and occupation in those same areas to identify local industries and occupations characterized by recent labor shortage or surplus situations. Finally, data on the reasons for unemployment would be useful in analyzing the nature and causes of local unemployment problems. Such additional data would allow for identification of the amount of unemployment due to layoffs in local industries and the amount of unemployment due to entry or re-entry in the labor force. Knoweldge of the recall status of job losers would be useful in distinguishing between those whose unemployment problems are temporary in nature and perhaps effectively resolved through the provision of unemployment insurance benefits and those members of the local unemployed population who may well be in need of CETA-related employment and training services.[26]

Earnings and Income Data

As noted in the previous two chapters of this report, the eligibility criteria for participation in most CETA programs are based upon both the family income and labor force status of the applicant. To facilitate the planning of local CETA employment and training programs, a number of different types of local earnings and income data should be made available to prime sponsor planners. Data on the mean and median annual incomes of households and families in the prime sponsor planning area and local labor areas should be available each year, including estimates of the overall proportion of families and households with total annual incomes below either the OMB poverty line or 70 percent of the BLS lower living standard income level (adjusted for family size) pertinent to the local area.[27]

Detailed data on the annual earnings of workers in various demographic and socioeconomic groups and on the annual incomes of families and households headed by persons in various demographic groups (age, sex, race) should be produced for CETA prime sponsor planning areas and local labor areas at least every five years. In addition to the data on the total annual incomes of local households and families, prime sponsor planners should also be provided with data on the sources of those incomes, including wages and salaries, unemployment compensation, and public assistance income. The data on sources of income are needed to determine the eligibility of applicants for participation in programs under various CETA titles.[28]

Data on the annual earnings of workers in selected occupations and industries together with information on the sources of those annual earnings (weeks and hours of employment, average hourly wages) would be useful for planning local CETA employment and training programs in a number of different ways. First, such data would allow a detailed analysis to be made of the occupational and industrial characteristics of jobs that fail to provide workers with earned incomes sufficiently large to allow them or their families to escape from the ranks of the economically disadvantaged.[29] This information would allow prime sponsor planners to identify elements of the local "underemployed" population and potential candidates for participation in worker upgrading programs under Title II C and VII of CETA. Second, these data would assist in the selection of occupational areas for the provision of classroom and OJT training. Knowledge of the employment stability and weekly or hourly wages of jobs in various local occupations and industries is crucial to the selection of occupational areas for training and to the job development and placement process.

Data on the Economically Disadvantaged

Knowledge of the numbers and the demographic, socioeconomic, and labor force characteristics of the economically disadvantaged populations of local prime sponsor planning areas and local labor areas is critical to the targeting of CETA resources, the design of a local services mix, and the provision of appropriate supportive services to program participants. Identification of the size and characteristics of the local economically disadvantaged population is dependent upon the availability of the data on the demographic characteristics of the local population and the annual incomes of local households and families discussed above.

Detailed data on the demographic, socioeconomic, and labor force characteristics of the local economically disadvantaged population would be needed by CETA prime sponsors at least once every five years. The targeting of employment and training resources under Titles II and VII of CETA should be based upon detailed knowledge of the characteristics and specific employment problems of the economically disadvantaged. Such targeting for structurally-oriented programs does not require detailed annual estimates of the characteristics of the economically disadvantaged. In preparing the annual plans for various CETA programs, however, prime sponsor planners should ideally have access to some data source providing annual estimates of the total number and selected demographic characteristics of the local economically disadvantaged population.

Data on the labor force, employment, and earnings experiences of the economically disadvantaged would be useful to CETA prime sponsor planners by allowing them to identify and analyze the factors influencing the low earnings and incomes of this group, including low labor force participation, inability to obtain full-time, year-round jobs, and low hourly wages.[30] Knowledge of the diversity of the problems encountered by various subgroups of the economically disadvantaged would be particulary useful in planning an appropriate services mix, determining the required types of linkages between CETA activities and titles to provide various subgroups of participants with an array of employment and training services that will enhance their long-term employability, and arranging for the provision of necessary support services to strengthen participants' attachment to the labor force.[31]

A more comprehensive analysis of the employment and earnings problems of the local unemployed and economically disadvantaged populations, including current deficiencies on the demand side of the local labor market as well as the human capital limitations of the unemployed and the poor, would be useful not only for policymaking and program planning within the local CETA system, but for other major factors in the employment and training system as well.[32] Other institutions that would benefit from such an analysis include the public vocational education system, the Job Service, state and local economic development agencies and social service agencies.[33] Greater recognition by prime sponsors of the need for increased state and local economic development efforts and for increased provision of support services by social service agencies will likely foster the development of closer linkages among these agencies as called for in the 1978 CETA reauthorization.[34] Closer ties with the economic development community are needed to increase the numbers and types of unsubsidized jobs available to the unemployed and economically disadvantaged currently being served by the local CETA system, and strengthened linkages between the local CETA and social services systems will help reduce the barriers to more active labor force participation by the economically disadvantaged.

Industrial Employment and Occupational Information Needs of CETA Prime Sponsors

The previous section of this chapter was devoted to a discussion of the labor force information needs of CETA prime sponsors for policymaking and program planning purposes. This section of the chapter will focus on the industry employment and occupational information needs of CETA prime sponsors for policymaking and planning purposes. The "demand side" data requirements will be examined first.[35] Table 3-2 provides a listing of the required types of data or information, including a description of the desirable geographic coverage, frequency of availability, and characteristics of each of the required data elements.

Industry Employment Data

The first major set of employment data required by CETA prime sponsors is that of data on the industrial structure of the local economy. Data on the level of employment in local industries within the prime sponsor and local labor areas should be made available on a quarterly and annual average basis. The industry employment data should be classified on the basis of 3-digit SIC industry categories. The availability of such timely and detailed industry employment data would allow CETA prime sponsor planners to track overall trends in the job generating capacity of the local economy and shifts over time in the industrial composition of the local economy. Knowledge of employment growth within industries of the local economy is particularly critical to the planning and design of job training programs and the job development and placement process.

To assist in the development of OJT slots for CETA participants and in the job placement of terminees from local CETA employment and training programs, prime sponsors should also have access to listings of economic establishments in each three-digit SIC industry in the local labor area(s). These listings would ideally contain the names, addresses, and employment-size classes of all establishments employing some given minimum number of workers (5) in each three-

Table 3-2: Industry Employment and Occupational Information Needs for CETA Prime Sponsors for Policymaking and Program Planning

Type of Data or Information	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Industry Employment Data	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsor; Labor area(s) in which prime sponsor is located and contiguous labor areas	Quarterly and annual average employment in industries	Aggregate employment levels of industries classified on a 3-digit SIC basis	Availability of seasonal adjustment factors for the quarterly employment data for groups of industries
Major Local Employers	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsor; Labor area(s) in which prime sponsor is located	Updates of local establishment listings every two to three years	Names, addresses, and employment size-classes of all establishments employing 5 or more workers in each 3-digit SIC industry	Name(s) of key contact persons in establishment with employee hiring responsibilities
Occupational Staffing Pattern	Statewide estimates; Estimates for major local labor areas of the state	Once every three to five years	Detailed information on occupational structure of employment by industry: Occupational data presented on a 4-digit SOC basis; Industry data on a 3-digit SIC basis	Occupational employment data should be capable of being aggregated across industries; Data base should allow tracking of changes in the occupational structure of industry employment over time; Occupational data should be comparable in classification with other types of occupational information

Table 3-2: (continued)

Type of Data or Information	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Labor Turnover and Accessions Data				
(i) Labor Turnover Data	Statewide estimates; Estimates by major local labor areas of state	Monthly	Detailed information on total accessions, new hires, total separations, quits, fires and lay-offs by 3-digit SIC industry	
(ii) Occupational New Hires Data	Statewide estimates; Estimates for major local labor areas of state	Quarterly	Detailed information on new hires by 4-digit SOC occupation and selected 3-digit SIC industries; Sources of newly hired workers	Should provide estimates of hourly wage rates for new hires in selected occupations; Survey should provide data indicating the recruitment methods used to obtain applicants, including data on the number of new workers hired from institutional training sources as well as type of institution (CETA, Voc. Ed. etc.) for selected occupations

Table 3-2: (continued)

Type of Data or Information	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Job Vacancy Data	Statewide estimates; Estimates for major local labor areas of states	Quarterly	Detailed information on the industrial and occupational composition of current job openings; Occupational vacancy data should be provided on a 4-digit SOC basis; Industry vacancy data should be provided on a 3-digit SIC basis	Concept of a current job opening should be comparable to that of unemployment concepts; Occupational data should be comparable in classification with other types of occupational information; Vacancy survey should provide estimates of wage rates offered by employers for job openings by occupation; Survey should provide estimates of durations of job openings; Survey should delineate between part-time and full-time job openings

Table 3-2: (continued)

Type of Data or Information	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Short-Term and Long-Term Projections of State and Local Manpower Requirements				
(i) Short-term Projections	State and local labor areas	Annual	Projections of short-term outlook for industry and occupational employment growth, for selected sets of industries and occupations; Projection period would most desirably range over a 12 month or two year time span	Short-term projections of industry employment would be generated by state econometric models rather than by existing BLS/SESA industry employment projections techniques
(ii) Long-term Projections	States and major labor areas of the states	Projection updates every three years	Projections of industry and occupational employment in the target year of the projection period by 3-digit SIC and 4-digit SOC; Projections of annual average job openings due to both growth and replacement by occupation on a 4-digit SOC code basis; Target year for projections should be 4-6 years from current base year	Capability of producing cross-industry estimates of employment by occupation on a 4-digit SOC code basis

Table 3-2: (continued)

Type of Data or Information	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Wages Rates and Weekly Hours Data by Occupation	States and local labor areas of the state	Annual	Estimates of average hourly or weekly wage rates and beginning hourly or weekly wages for selected workers in occupations on a 4-digit SOC code basis; Estimates of average weekly hours of work in selected occupations on a 4-digit SOC code basis	Estimates of average hourly or weekly wage rates of workers in selected occupations by industry
The Structure of Internal Labor Markets and Identification of Ports of Entry	Local labor areas	Studies conducted every three to four years	Identification of entry level occupations within selected industries of the local labor area; Identification of the nature and structure of promotional ladders within firms: Location of selected high net demand occupations in the internal labor markets of firms	Types of on-the-job training provided to incumbent employees to allow them to upgrade themselves within the firm; Identification of entry level jobs lacking links to internal career ladders

Table 3-2: (continued)

Type of Data or Information	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Hiring Policies and Hiring Patterns of Firms	Local labor areas	Studies conducted every three to four years	Identify specific skills, educational, and experience requirements of local employers by occupation; Identify quality of working conditions in an occupation; Identify seasonal patterns of hiring activities of firms; Focus efforts on a set of previously identified industry/occupational job clusters characterized by favorable projected employment opportunities and acceptable wages	Identify additional hiring requirements; including test scores, competency levels, licensing, bondings, health and union membership; obtain an understanding of general "terms of employment" in an occupation

digit SIC industry in the relevant local labor area(s).[36] As will be noted in more detail below, these establishment listings would also be highly useful in generating samples for conducting local surveys of employer hiring practices and policies. These establishment listings would be updated to capture births and deaths of establishments approximately every two to three years.

Occupational Staffing Pattern Data

A major input into the development of an occupational information system for use by CETA prime sponsor planners, evaluators, and administrators is that of data on the detailed occupational composition of industry employment at the state and local level. Data on local industries' staffing patterns would provide the basis for a wide variety of analytical and operational tasks associated with CETA program planning and operations.

Occupational staffing pattern data by industry would be potentially useful in identifying that subset of local growth industries in which a substantial number of CETA-trainable jobs exist.[37] In addition, a number of individuals have suggested that updated occupational staffing pattern data could be used as the base for the derivation of a number of key local labor market variables. For example, occupation specific data on unemployment rates, new hire rates, and job vacancy rates could be computed with the use of staffing pattern estimates and current industry employment data.[38] The industry-occupation matrices based upon these staffing patterns data would also be used to provide key inputs into both short-range and long-run projections of job opportunities by occupation.[39]

A comprehensive data base on the occupational composition of state and local industry employment could also serve as the starting point for more detailed and specific surveys on occupational labor market structure and behavior. The occupational staffing pattern information could be used to target such studies to specific areas of interest to local CETA planners.[40] Such staffing pattern data could also be used to substantially bolster the job development and placement efforts of local CETA prime sponsors. Together with other data on industry employment growth and the location of establishments in a local labor area, the staffing pattern data could assist in the identification of establishments and occupations for targeting OJT development and job placement efforts. Since it is widely held that industry staffing patterns change only slowly over time, it would only be necessary to collect such data once every three to five years. To be most useful for CETA planning purposes, however, these data should contain substantial industrial (three-digit SIC), occupational (four-digit SIC), and geographic (statewide and major local labor area) detail.

Data on Accessions and Labor Turnover

A key concern of many prime sponsor policymakers and planners is that CETA resources not be targeted to local industries and occupations in which placements can be made easily due to the existence of high voluntary labor turnover. There often exists a set of establishments whose employment levels are unstable and whose work force is characterized by high rates of turnover due to job instability and/or low wages.[42] A number of different kinds of information on available job opportunities are required to determine the set of CETA-trainable occupations that will provide trainees with the types of post-program employment and earnings experiences that will achieve the long-run goals and objectives of the local CETA system.[43] Among the information required to identify such jobs offering the potential for employment and earnings gains are data on rates of labor turnover by detailed industry and occupation. Included in such a data base would be data on the numbers and occupational distribution of new hires and industry-specific data on total accessions, new hires, and recalls from lay-off as well as total separations, quits, fires, and lay-offs. The data on the industry and occupational composition of new hires would, in combination with time series data on industry/occupational employment indicate areas where job development and placement efforts would most likely pay-off.[44] The collection of information on new hires by occupation would also be accompanied by attempts to discern the types of recruitment methods employed by firms in successfully hiring new workers, including the identification of the institutional training sources of such new hires, if relevant.

The data on industry accessions and separations can be used in conjunction with one another by local prime sponsor planners to provide a general indication of overall labor market growth and decline. Rapidly increasing accession rates may signal growing tightness in state and local labor markets. Quit rates and lay-off rates can also be used as indicators of local labor demand conditions signifying likely growth and decline in industry employment.[45]

Industry turnover rates can be used as a starting point in identifying the set of local industries characterized by relatively high employment instability. Additionally, seasonal patterns in hiring and lay-offs of local industries can also be discerned from an analysis of nonseasonally-adjusted local labor turnover data. The data on the occupational composition of new hires and the data on industry accession and separation rates would ideally be produced on a monthly basis, for states and major labor areas.

Job Vacancy Data

In designing their overall employment and training strategies, local CETA policymakers and planners require information capable of shedding insights into the nature and causes of unemployment and poverty at the state and local level. Data on the industrial and occupational composition of current job openings are a basic requirement for successfully diagnosing the causes of unemployment at the state and local level and developing appropriate strategies to combat such problems.[46] Data on the occupational characteristics of job openings comparable in nature to data on the occupational characteristics of the unemployed are needed for assessing the nature of local unemployment problems at a point in time. If estimates of ratios of unemployment to job openings are available on an occupational basis, labor market analysts can sort out aggregate unemployment levels into their demand deficient, structural, and frictional components.[47] By classifying overall unemployment into these various categories, CETA planners and policymakers can then design a mix of employment and training strategies to combat local unemployment problems. Such planning would ideally be based upon systematic knowledge of the relative influence of each type of unemployment on the overall level of unemployment prevailing at the state and local level.[48]

In addition to providing information on the nature and causes of unemployment at the local level, detailed information on the industrial and occupational composition of current job openings can assist CETA planners in targeting CETA training resources to specific areas of occupational shortage. Through careful comparisons of the levels of unemployment and job openings within occupations, CETA planners can obtain information on those occupations in which current labor shortages appear to exist. Through the use of job openings data by detailed industry and occupation, job development and job placement efforts of CETA prime sponsors can also likely be improved. By using the job vacancy data in conjunction with knowledge of industry employment growth and the occupational composition of local industries, job development and placement activities can be more effectively targeted to match simultaneously the needs of local growth employers and those CETA participants terminating from employment and training programs. Data on the numbers and durations of job openings by industry and occupation would ideally be accompanied by information on their associated wage rates and weekly hours of work. Job vacancy data would ideally be produced on a quarterly basis for states and major local labor areas.

Projections of Industry and Occupational Employment for States and Local Labor Areas

In addition to the above data on the levels and industrial and occupational characteristics of employment and current job openings, CETA planners responsible for developing employment and training strategies also require information about projected changes in industrial and occupational employment. The desired data elements would include estimates of future levels of employment by industry and occupation and estimates of the annual average numbers of job openings due to growth and replacement (deaths, retirements) by occupation over the projection period.[49]

Ideally, CETA planners would have access to both short-term (one to two years) and longer-term (4-6 years) projections of industrial and occupational employment levels and expected job openings by occupation. Such short-term projections would facilitate the targeting of employment and training resources to those occupational areas in which CETA-eligible individuals are most likely to find employment. In addition, short-term projections of employer needs by industry and occupation would likely assist prime sponsors in their current efforts to link local employment and training resources more closely with the private sector.[50] In addition to facilitating the planning of long-term strategies for employment and training programs of prime sponsors, the longer-term occupational projections would also provide useful inputs into career guidance and counseling at the state and local level.[51]

Unlike long-term projections whose focus is on the growth and decline of employment by industrial and occupational category on a comprehensive basis, short-term projections may be more narrowly focused for planning purposes. Building upon the findings of longer-term projections techniques, short-run projections would focus upon short-term employment prospects in narrowly defined industry-occupation job clusters.[52] Such information can be highly useful for CETA planning purposes since such short-term forecasts would account not only for secular changes in employment levels, but anticipated changes in employment resulting from short-run business condition changes. Since long-term projections methodologies currently are not capable of capturing the effects of cyclical changes in economic activity, short-term projections should be designed to indicate likely demand conditions within local labor markets for specific occupations in which local prime sponsors are considering the establishment or expansion of training programs.[53]

Long-term employment projections data would most desirably be produced by detailed industry (3-digit SIC) and occupation (4-digit SOC) for states and major labor areas. Such projections would ideally be updated every two to three years to incorporate more recent trends in employment growth and change including recent and unforeseen economic development activities. Short-term projections should be based in part upon the findings of longer-term projections and other demand-related data and should be focused only upon selected industry occupation job clusters. Such projections should be conducted on an annual basis immediately prior to the beginning of the prime sponsor's planning cycle and should be provided for major local labor areas.

Wages and Hours

Among the primary characteristics of jobs for which CETA planners require information, are the hourly wage rates and weekly hours of work of jobs classified by their occupation and industry. Information on the beginning and average wage rates of an occupation can provide CETA planners with one indication of the likely quality of a job.[54] Data on the weekly hours of work in an occupation can be used in combination with the hourly wage rate data to provide an indication of the ability of an occupation to generate desired levels of weekly earnings for CETA program participants. Given the emphasis of the 1978 CETA reauthorization legislation on improving the earned incomes of participants, such wage information takes on added importance in the planning process. Data on beginning and average hourly wage rates and average weekly hours of work in an occupation need only be collected on an annual basis for states and local labor areas. In addition, these data collection efforts should be targeted at a selected number of industry-occupation job clusters that are being given serious consideration as potential candidates for the provision of CETA training, both classroom and on-the-job training activities.

Information on the Structure of the Internal Labor Markets of Local Firms

In addition to the information on current and projected job opportunities by occupation in local labor areas, prime sponsor planners would ideally have access to information on the internal labor markets of local firms, particularly those in local growth industries. Among the desired elements would be information on the occupational characteristics of the ports of entry within these firms and the nature and occupational structure of promotional ladders within the firm. Such information would prove to be quite useful to CETA planners in determining the types of occupational areas in which OJT or classroom training should be provided under CETA programs.[55] Information on the ports of entry and internal promotional ladders would also substantially assist prime sponsor program planners in determining the appropriate content and nature of course curriculum that should be developed for training programs in a given occupational area. As Paul Burton has argued,

> The process of deciding on an appropriate vocational education curriculum ought to be carried out on the basis of how employers hire and train in particular industries on a particular community...
>
> These are matters that can be determined by asking employers what their practices are, what they want them to be and whether it makes sense to change them. 56

A comprehensive occupational information system at the state and local level should ideally contain a local occupational inventory of entry-level jobs in local industries. Such an inventory would identify the set of local establishments that provide particular types of entry-level employment opportunities and include information on the specific occupational characteristics of these jobs as well as their skill requirements. An occupational inventory of this type, however, should not be viewed as a substitute for an establishment-based job vacancy survey.[57] The primary purpose of this inventory is simply to identify the nature and characteristics of ports of entry into existing firms within local labor areas.[58] Ideally, this inventory would be updated every two to three years to reflect changing economic development activities in the local area, including location of new firms and changes in hiring policies.

In addition to the information on ports of entry into local firms, information related to promotion prospects for workers in selected entry level jobs should also be developed for planning local employment and training programs. Such efforts would focus upon an identification of the existence of opportunities for advancement within local firms. This would include information on the occupational structure of internal career ladders within firms as well as the nature of the skills required to perform adequately on the job at each step in the internal career ladder.[59] Efforts to develop such information would not be solely focused on a quantitative analysis of internal career ladders. Instead, they would focus upon developing an understanding of the nature and degree of the promotion potential that exists among the set of entry-level jobs identified through the occupational inventory described above.

Studies of the occupational and skill structure of internal promotion ladders should be conducted every two to three years for selected industry occupation job clusters within local labor areas.

Hiring Policies and Hiring Patterns of Local Firms

Information on local firms' hiring standards and requirements for specific occupations is a critical input into the planning and design of CETA training programs. Among the types of information that program planners would ideally have access to is the specific set of skills required by local employers or applicants for current job openings. Such information would be useful not only in selecting occupations for training, but also in developing training course curricula.[60] The possession of a specific set of skills by an applicant, however, is not the sole criterion relied upon by employers in making their hiring decisions. Information on employer hiring requirements with respect to previous work experience, minimum educational attainment levels, occupational licensing, bonding, union affiliation, and physical characteristics would also prove desirable for planning purposes.[61] Such information would also likely prove to be quite useful in the CETA intake and assessment process by assisting in the determination of the set of CETA-eligible individuals "who most need and can be most helped by training."[62] With such information, CETA intake and assessment counselors can better determine the range and nature of employment and training services required by CETA clientele in order to prepare them for employment in specific occupations.

In addition to the above information on hiring policies and standards of local firms, CETA planners as well as planners of other employment-oriented educational and training programs would benefit from knowledge of the hiring patterns of local firms for various occupations.[63] Given knowledge of the specific times of the year in which local employers tend to recruit workers in an occupation, the timing of training programs can be planned so that program completion dates can coincide with such recruitment activities. By appropriately timing the completion dates of programs, the number of program completers placed in a holding or nonpositive termination status at the time of their termination from the program would be reduced.

Additional desirable information on companies' personnel practices would cover such issues as job security/lay-off policies, the availability of training or supported education opportunities, the general conditions of the job, such as shift work, overtime policies, physical condition of the work station, leave and vacation policies, and company fringe benefits, including paid vacation, leave and health and disability insurance.[64] Such additional information would assist CETA planners in assessing the "quality" of jobs in occupational areas in which they are considering the implementation of a training program.

Much of the information on local employer hiring policies and practices as well as knowledge of the terms of employment is not readily quantifiable. Qualitative descriptions would be required in most cases. Efforts should be undertaken to develop an understanding of such employment practices for specific groups of jobs in industry/occupation clusters characterized by favorable projected employment opportunities. Ideally, such information would be updated every two to three years.

Occupational Supply Information for CETA Planning Purposes

The previous sections of this chapter have been primarily focused upon CETA prime sponsor planners' needs for demand-related data, such as industry and occupational employment data, and for information on the characteristics of occupations (hiring requirements, wages, ties to mobility ladders). This section of the chapter is devoted to a review of the types of occupational supply information that would be most useful for CETA program planning. Table 3-3 provides a summary of the types of occupational supply information that would be desirable for planning local employment and training programs under CETA. This table is divided into two parts. Table 3-3A contains a listing of desired information on the occupational characteristics of the unemployed while table 3-3B summarizes the types of information needed by CETA planners on the size, nature, and occupational characteristics of institutional training programs and apprenticeship programs in their local labor area(s).[65]

Occupational Characteristics of the Unemployed

Table 3-2 presented a number of different types of data, including industry employment trends data, job vacancy data, and occupational employment projections, that would be useful in planning CETA training programs. In selecting occupational areas for training, CETA planners should also take into consideration the number of unemployed workers in occupations. As noted earlier, comparisons of the number of current job openings by occupation with the number of unemployed workers in that occupation would provide some insights into the types of occupations that are in "shortage" or "surplus" in a local labor area.[66] The existence of job vacancies in an occupation does not automatically imply that the occupation is in shortage. Planners must take into account both the number of vacancies and the number of unemployed persons in an occupation in determining whether or not an occupation is in "shortage."[67] Identification of such "shortage" occupational areas should play a critical role in the planning process for all major actors in the employment and training system. The successful training of unemployed workers in "surplus" occupations for employment in "shortage" occupations could have a favorable net impact on the overall level of unemployment in a local labor area.[68]

Ideally, prime sponsor planners would have access to comprehensive data on the occupational characteristics of the unemployed in their planning and local labor area(s).[69] These data on the occupational characteristics of all of the unemployed would be available on a quarterly and annual average basis and would provide information on both the average monthly number of unemployed persons in the occupation and the unemployment rate for the occupation.[70] The unemployment data would be produced at a level of detail equivalent to that of 4-digit

Table 3-3A: Occupational Characteristics of the Unemployed

Type of Data	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Occupational Unemployment Data (all unemployed)	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors; Local labor area(s) in which prime sponsor is located	Annual estimates of the occupational characteristics of the unemployed and annual average unemployment rates by occupation	Number of unemployed and unemployment rates for workers in occupations at level of detail equivalent to 4-digit SOC codes; Distribution of unemployed in such occupations by the duration of their current unemployment spell	Distribution of unemployed by reason for being unemployed (job loser, job leaver, etc.)
Occupational Unemployment Data (Insured Unemployment)	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors; Local labor area(s) in which prime sponsor is located	Quarterly and annual average estimates of the industrial and occupational characteristics of the insured unemployed	Number of insured unemployed and insured unemployment rates for workers in industries at 3-digit SIC level and for workers in occupations at level of detail equivalent to 4-digit SOC codes; Distribution of the unemployed in such occupations by the on-going duration of their unemployment claim	Recall status of the insured unemployed; Barriers to their employment; Household or family income status

Table 3-3A: (continued)

Type of Data	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Occupational Characteristics of Active Applicants in Local SESA Job Placement Offices	Local SESA offices serving the prime sponsor's planning area; Local SESA offices serving subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors; All local SESA offices serving the local area(s) in which the prime sponsor is located	Quarterly and annual average number of active applicants by occupation	Number of active applicants by occupation at level of detail equivalent to four-digit SOC code; unemployment insurance claimant status of active applicants	Economically disadvantaged status of active applicants; Barriers to employment

SOC codes to allow for their use in conjunction with the available employment data by occupation.

In addition to the data on the number of unemployed persons by occupation, it would also be desirable for CETA planners to have access to data on the distribution of the unemployed in each occupational area by the durations of their unemployment spells and the reasons for their unemployment. Information on durations of unemployment and reasons for unemployment (job loser, job leaver, new entrant, re-entrant) would be useful in providing insights into the factors influencing the different rates of unemployment among occupations and the severity of the unemployment problems of workers in particular occupational groups. Such information would assist in the identification of the occupational characteristics of the "structurally" unemployed, particularly those long-term unemployed job losers whose skills are in surplus in the local labor area.

Occupational Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed

In the absence of such comprehensive unemployment data at the local level, it would be desirable for CETA prime sponsor planners to have ready access to data on the numbers and occupational characteristics of the insured unemployed and unemployed active job applicants in the files of the local placement offices of the Job Service. Ideally, CETA planners would be provided with data on the industrial and occupational characteristics of the insured unemployed within their planning jurisdictions and local labor area(s) on a quarterly and annual average basis. The above unemployment data could be utilized in conjunction with covered industry employment and occupational employment data to calculate insured unemployment rates by industry and occupation.[71]

The industrial and occupational data on the insured unemployed would be provided on a 3-digit SIC basis and 4-digit SOC code basis, respectively. Additional desirable data on the occupational characteristics of the insured unemployed would include data on the durations of their unemployment claims, their recall status, their perceived barriers to employment, and their household or family income status. The latter information would be useful in determining the eligibility of the insured unemployed for participation in CETA programs and the types of employment and training services that they would likely require to become employable.[72]

Occupational Characteristics of Active Job Service Applicants

The data on the occupational characteristics of active job applicants in the placement offices of the Job Service would be provided to CETA planners on a quarterly and annual average basis. The data would be produced on both a prime sponsor planning area basis and a local labor area basis. The occupational data would be available at a level of detail equivalent to a four-digit SOC code. The data on active job applicants would also be appropriately adjusted to exclude those individuals currently receiving U.I. benefits to prevent double counting of the unemployed when U.I. claimants data and Job Service active applicant data are pooled.[73] Additional data on the economically disadvantaged status of active applicants and their barriers to employment would be useful for determining the eligibility of such applicants for CETA programs and in designing an appropriate services mix, including support services, for the local employment and training system.

Information on Institutional-Based Occupational Training Programs

In chapter 2 of this report, the nature of the planning requirements for CETA employment and training programs were discussed. Among the types of information that CETA prime sponsors have been asked to include in their master plans are the following: the procedures that they would implement to obtain the active involvement of educational agencies and community-based organizations in the planning and operation of CETA programs; the methods that they would use to select service delivery agents from an "inventory of potentially available deliverers of service"; and provisions they had developed for making use of the services and facilities of existing Federal, state, and local educational, employment and training agencies, including state and local vocational education schools, area skills centers, and community colleges.[74]

Table 3-3B on the following page provides a summary listing of the types of information on non-CETA classroom training and apprenticeship programs that would be most useful to CETA planners in developing their master and annual plans. The desired information on these institutional training and apprenticeship programs would only need to be provided on an annual basis, and, in some instances, updates of the information every two to three years would likely suffice. The basic information required is that of a listing of the names and

Table 3-3B: Information on Non-CETA Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs for CETA Prime Sponsor Program Planning

Type of Information	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Non-CETA Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs	Local labor area(s) in which prime sponsor is located and contiguous labor areas; Local labor area(s) in which subgrantees of Balance of State prime sponsors are located	Annual basis	Names and addresses of institutions and apprenticeship boards offering occupationally-oriented classroom training or sponsoring apprenticeship training programs; Types of programs in which occupational training is provided at level of detail equivalent to six-digit O.E. code or four-digit SOC code; Level at which such program is offered (secondary/post-secondary): Number of enrollments and completions by program	Placement performance of such programs; Costs of enrolling in such programs; entry criteria of school or program

addresses of the institutions, both public and private, offering classroom training or apprenticeship training in occupational areas within the local labor area(s) (including contiguous labor areas in some instances) in which the prime sponsor is located. This basic inventory of training sources, including apprenticeship programs, would include information by service provider on the types of occupations in which training is currently provided, the level at which such training is provided (secondary, postsecondary, adult), and the number of persons enrolled in and completing such programs during the year.[75] The institutional training programs of these service providers would be classified on an occupational basis equivalent to a six-digit Office of Education program code or a four-digit SOC code (or combination of such SOC codes).[76]

It would also be desirable for that inventory to provide information on the recent placement performance of such programs, including the proportion of program graduates obtaining employment related to their training field, the per student costs of enrolling in such programs, and the entry criteria for such programs, including formal educational requirements, test scores, etc. The information on placement performance and costs would be particularly useful in gauging the demonstrated effectiveness of such programs and their relative cost effectiveness. Prime sponsors are theoretically required to present such data in their master plans to justify the selection of their own service delivery agents.[77]

It should be emphasized that the information elements requested in table 3-3B are not intended to be used by CETA prime sponsor planners for undertaking comprehensive occupational supply-demand matching.[78] While efforts of this type are needed to assist in the determination of the "unmet skill needs" of the states, the complexity of the tasks involved in conducting supply-demand matching makes it mandatory that such efforts be conducted at the state level under the auspices of the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees.[79] There is a role to be played in this process by several state employment and training agencies, including the Research Divisions of the State Employment Security Agencies the State Divisions of Occupational Education, and the State Employment and Training Councils. The primary purpose of the inventory of training institutions and programs discussed above, however, is that of encouraging CETA prime sponsors to carefully and systematically review the existing institutional training system in their local labor areas in selecting service delivery agents for their classroom skills training programs. Over time, such careful assessments will hopefully improve the degree of coordination between the CETA system and both the public vocational training system and apprenticeship programs. Such coordination is a major objective of the 1978 CETA Reauthorization legislation.

Occupational Outputs of the CETA Employment and Training System

In order to properly evaluate the performance of their local employment and training systems, CETA prime sponsors should be actively involved in efforts to measure and analyze the immediate, short-term, and long-term outcomes of their programs. Among the outcomes that should be examined as part of this evaluation process are the immediate, short-term, and long-term occupational outputs of their employment and training programs. Table 3-4 on the following page provides a summary description of the types of information on occupational outputs that CETA prime sponsors should generate on a regular basis for internal evaluation purposes. The frequency with which such data are generated by prime sponsors for internal evaluation purposes will not necessarily be the same as the frequency with which they are reported to the regional and national offices of the Employment and Training Administration (ETA).

It should be noted that, until the passage of the 1978 CETA Amendments, prime sponsors were not required to report information to the regional or national offices of ETA on the occupations of the jobs obtained by terminees from any of their employment and training programs. The outcomes data reported to ETA were confined to the total numbers and types of terminations, including those obtaining unsubsidized employment, distribution of the hourly wages of those jobs, and the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of those placed in unsubsidized jobs.[80] The 1978 CETA Amendments called upon the Secretary of Labor to develop a uniform system for prime sponsors to report the number of enrollments, completers, and placements from their classroom and OJT training programs.[81] The occupational data were to be reported at a level of detail equivalent to that of a 4-digit SOC code. At the current time, such a reporting system has not yet been formally developed by the national office of ETA.[82]

Data on the immediate occupational outputs (i.e., outputs at the time of participants' termination from the program) of CETA-related training programs

Table 3-4: Immediate and Longer-Term Occupational Outputs of CETA Prime Sponsors' Employment and Training Programs

Type of Data	(A) Desirable Geographic Coverage	(B) Desirable Frequency of Availability	(C) Primary Desirable Characteristics of Data	(D) Other Desirable Characteristics of Data
Immediate Occupational Outputs of Employment and Training Programs	Prime sponsor area; Subgrantee areas of Balance of state prime sponsors	Quarterly and annual basis	Occupational characteristics of unsubsidized jobs obtained by CETA terminees from all Title II B and C and Title VII classroom and OJT training activities and from selected adult work experience programs, youth programs, and PSE Programs; Occupational detail at 4-digit SOC code or its equivalent	Industries and firms in which unsubsidized jobs are obtained; Beginning hourly wages and weekly hours of work on jobs obtained by terminees
Longer-term Occupational Outputs of Employment and Training Programs	Prime sponsor area; subgrantee areas of Balance of State prime sponsors	Annual basis	Occupations of jobs held by terminees from above CETA programs at the time of the follow-up survey (6-12 months following date of termination); Occupational data at 4-digit SOC code level or its equivalent	Hourly wages and hours of work on job at time of the follow-up contact; Employment and earnings experiences of terminees during entire period covered by follow-up survey, including occupational and industrial mobility; Reasons for not being employed at the time of the follow-up contact

would desirably be produced by prime sponsors on both a quarterly and annual basis. Initially, data on these occupational outputs would be provided only for classroom skills training programs and OJT programs under Title II B, Title II C, and Title VII of CETA. Over time, however, particularly as the Title II D and VI PSE programs of prime sponsors become to be viewed more as employability development programs for participants with substantive skills training components, the coverage of this system should expand to other programs. The level of occupational detail at which these immediate employment outcomes are produced by prime sponsors should be equivalent to a 4-digit SOC code. In addition to the information on the occupational characteristics of unsubsidized jobs obtained by program terminees, it would be desirable for CETA prime sponsors to collect and produce data on the industries in which those jobs were obtained, their beginning hourly wage rates, and the weekly number of hours of work.[83] The data on the industry attachment of job placements would allow CETA prime sponsors to determine the nature and degree of the penetration of the local economy by their job placement efforts. The data on beginning hourly wages and weekly hours of work could be used in combination with one another to produce estimates of the earned income potential of such jobs.

The evaluation system of local CETA prime sponsors would ideally go well beyond the measurement and analysis of the immediate outcomes of their employment and training programs. A comprehensive follow-up system designed to track the actual postprogram labor force, employment, and earnings experiences of training program participants would provide information on the occupational characteristics of all jobs they held during the period of the follow-up survey (6-12 months).[84] The occupational data would again be collected at a level of detail equivalent to that of a four-digit SOC code and would ideally be supplemented by information on the hourly wages and weekly hours of work of jobs held by participants at the time of the follow-up survey. The follow-up survey would also be able to provide information on the employment and earnings experiences of participants during the entire follow-up period and hopefully would yield insights into the degree of their occupational and industrial mobility during this time period.[85] Such data are necessary ingredients into the determination of the impact of training program participation upon the long-term employability and earned income status of the unemployed and economically disadvantaged, basic long-term goals of the national CETA system.[86]

Chapter 3: Footnotes

1. For a review of the actual nature of the planning process of CETA prime sponsors during the first few years of program operations,

   See: i) Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Impact on People, Places, Programs, particularly pp. 46-66;

   ii) Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control, particularly pp. 47-82.

2. For a discussion of the differences between strategic and tactical planning,

   See: Mangum, Garth; Morlock, James; Pines, Marion W.; and Snedeker, David; Job Market Futurity, particularly pp. 8-9, 34-35.

3. In a review of the paper on job vacancy statistics prepared by Harry Frumerman for the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Lazare Teper argued that:

   > We need to study the characteristics of job vacancies in the local markets to a degree unattained up to the present... More needs to be learned about employer hiring practices in the different industries by occupation, whether it involves hiring in the open market or by advancement through promotion... More has to be studied about jobs where promotion and advancement can only be attained by change of employers.

   See: Teper, Lazare, "Comments on the Paper of Harry Frumerman," Job Vacancy Statistics in the United States, Background Paper No. 3, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., May 1978, pp. 66-71.

4. For a more detailed discussion of the roles of program evaluation and the uses of evaluation findings at the prime sponsors level,

   See: Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training Programs at the Local Level, Volume I: The Role of Program Evaluation at the Local Level, particularly Chapter 1 and Volume II: The Use of Process, Outcome, and Benefit-Cost Evaluation Techniques, particularly pp. 1-51.

5. See: i) Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control, pp. 47-82.

   ii) Ripley, Randall B., et al., Areawide Planning in CETA, R&D Monograph 74, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

6. The data appearing in the annual plans of CETA prime sponsors have often been used solely to comply with the ETA planning requirements rather than as a basis for local policymaking or program management:

   See: i) Ripley, Randall, B., et al., Areawide Planning in CETA, particularly pp. 89-92;

   ii) Wurzburg, Gregory, "Summary of Findings and Recommendations," The Local Focus on Youth: A Review of Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (Report No. 3 in a Series), pp. 1-42.

   Similar situations also seem to occur in the planning of other educational and training programs, including public vocational education programs.

   See: Stevens, David W., "Planning Training Programs in the Absence of Labor Market Control," National Council on Employment Policy, Washington, D.C., 1978.

7. See: Mangum, Garth L. and Walsh, John, A Decade of Manpower Development and Training, p. 117.

8. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, pp. II-6, II-7.

9. The concept of "head of household" traditionally utilized in Bureau of Census household surveys and in the decennial population censuses has been replaced by a new set of concepts in the 1980 decennial census. The need for a concept similar to that of "primary earner" in the household does remain.

   See: i) "The 1980 Census Questionnaire," American Demographics, Vol. 1, No. 4, April 1979, pp. 25-31;

   ii) Herriot, Roger A., "The 1980 Census: Countdown for a Complete Count," Monthly Labor Review, September 1979, pp. 3-13.

10. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 103 (b) (3)."

11. Studies of the labor force behavior and unemployment problems of teens have revealed that central city youth tend to participate in the labor force at lower rates and experience higher rates of unemployment than their suburban counterparts.

   See: Westcott, Diane N., "Youth in the Labor Force: An Area Study," Monthly Labor Review, July 1978, pp. 3-9.

12. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 201."

13. For a review of the concept of "discouraged worker" used in conducting the CPS household survey,

See: i) Flaim, Paul O., "Discouraged Workers and Changes in Unemployment," Monthly Labor Review, March 1973, pp. 8-16;

ii) Finegan, T. Aldrich, "Improving Our Information on Discouraged Workers," Monthly Labor Review, September 1978, pp. 15-25.

The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics has recently recommended the adoption of changes in the definition of "discouraged workers" to require immediate availability for work and some job search activity in the past six months. For a more detailed review of these issues and the Secretary of Labor's views on such recommended changes,

See: i) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 3, 44-49;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Interim Report of the Secretary of Labor on the Recommendations of the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1980.

14. For a more detailed discussion of these issues regarding the nature and extent of job desires of nonparticipants,

See: i) Finegan, T. Aldrich, "The Measurement, Behavior, and Classification of Discouraged Workers," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 193-235;

ii) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, "Ch. 6: Adding Labor Force Information," pp. 83-103;

iii) Bouba, Maryann, and Sum, Andrew, The Extent of Job Desires of Persons Outside of the Labor Force in the United States and Massachusetts: Implications for Targetting CETA-Related Employment and Training Resources.

15. For a review of the planning uses of such information on perceived barriers to employment,

See: Mangum, Garth L., Morlock, James; Ines, Marion W.; and Snedeker, David; Job Market Futurity, pp. 167-182, 212-222, 296-303.

16. For a discussion of the relative merits of the employment/population ratio as a measure of labor market performance,

See: i) Shiskin, Julius, "Employment and Unemployment: The Doughnut or the Hole?" Monthly Labor Review, February 1976, pp. 3-10;

ii) Cain, Glen G., "Labor Force Concepts and Definitions in View of Their Purposes," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 3-45.

17. The master plans of CETA prime sponsors were expected to include discussions of arrangements that had been developed to prepare CETA participants for employment in nontraditional occupations.

    See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 103(a)(5)(C)."

18. A recent review of the concepts and definitions of part-time employment can be found in the following publication: Hedges, Janice Neipert and Gallogly, Stephen J., "Full and Part-Time: A Review of Definitions," Monthly Labor Review, March 1977, pp. 21-28.

19. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 3 (27)(A)."

20. For a detailed overview of the part-time labor market in the U.S. and Massachusetts and a discussion of issues related to the development of part-time job opportunities for the elderly and female family heads dependent on public assistance,

    See: Kennedy, Kim; Mazzeo, Katherine; Winkeller, Rachel; "Part-Time Employment in Massachusetts: Implications for Employment and Training Policy," Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning, and Evaluation, pp. 153-190.

21. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, p. II-13.

22. The local unemployment data would ideally be available in both a seasonally adjusted and unadjusted form.

23. For a review of issues related to the need and use of local unemployment data in allocating CETA monies,

    See:
    - i) Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control, pp. 15-46;
    - ii) Goldstein, Harold, "State and Local Labor Force Statistics," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1980, pp. 412-464;
    - iii) Mangum, Garth L., "Employment and Unemployment Statistics and the CETA Prime Sponsor;" Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 474-489.

24. See:
    - i) Vinson, Robert; Sum, Andrew; Bouba, Maryann; Ganz, Russ; Employment and Unemployment Developments in Massachusetts: An Overview of Their Level and Structure, 1971-77, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1979;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Unemployment of Adult Men, Adult Women, and Teenagers Was Little Changed in Most States in 1979--With Men's Rates Generally Lowest," February 1980.

25. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, pp. II-7, III-23, III-49.

26. In recent years, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has begun to break out the national unemployment data on job losers into two separate categories: job losers "on layoff" and "other job losers." The annual average unemployment data for 1978 revealed that job losers not awaiting recall are two times more likely (34.3%) to be members of the long-term unemployed than job losers on layoff (16.3%) and all other unemployed persons.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January 1979, "Table 14," p. 166.

27. To be classified as economically disadvantaged, an applicant's family income must not be in excess of the higher of either the OMB poverty line or 70 percent of the appropriate BLS lower living standard income level.

See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 3(8)."

28. In calculating the total family income of an applicant for eligibility determination purposes, the CETA prime sponsor is required to omit all income received in the form of unemployment compensation or cash public assistance payments.

29. Such information would also be useful in identifying the numbers of "primary" and "secondary" labor market jobs in state and local economies.

See: Harrison, Bennett and Sum, Andrew, Labor Market Data Needs from the Perspective of 'Dual' or 'Segmented' Labor Market Research, Background Paper No. 29, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1979.

30. Among the more recent studies examining the sources of income inadequacy of the economically disadvantaged are the following:

i) Bouba, Maryann and Sum, Andrew, Targetting CETA Resources: An Analysis of the Demographic and Labor Force Characteristics of Massachusetts Family Heads Potentially Eligible for CETA-Related Employment and Training Programs;

ii) Sum, Andrew; Meehan, Edward; and Ganz, Russell; "The Economically Disadvantaged in New England: Implications for Targetting CETA Resources;"

iii) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force.

31. The need for disaggregated data on and detailed analysis of the specific employment problems of the economically disadvantaged was spelled out recently by Marion Pines, Director of the city of Baltimore Prime Sponsor. She argued that,

> ..experience demonstrates that the program decisions to be made must focus on more than the number of potential clients in each category. Program models must be constructed to address the particular employment barriers of various significant segments. Experienced planners know that the 'economically disadvantaged' are not a homogeneous group adaptable to a single standardized form of manpower intervention.

See: Pines, Marion, "Comments on the Garth Mangum Paper," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 490-492.

32. For a discussion of the need for employment and training policy to be based upon an understanding of the demand side as well as the supply side of local labor markets,

See:
- i) Doeringer, Peter B., et al., Low-Income Labor Markets and Urban Manpower Programs: A Critical Assessment;
- ii) Doeringer, Peter B. and Piore, Michael J., Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis;
- iii) Harrison, Bennett, Education, Training, and the Urban Ghetto, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1972;
- iv) Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training Programs at the Local Level, Vol. II: The Role of Process, Outcome, and Benefit-Cost Evaluation Techniques, particularly pp. 1-31.

33. See: Doeringer, Peter B., "Comments on the Glen Cain Paper," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 46-51.

34. See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 2."

35. The concept of "labor demand" as used by economists is based upon a functional relationship between the quantity of labor that would be demanded by employers at various wage rates. Many of the data elements appearing in Table 3-2 are employment data, which in reality are influenced by both labor demand and supply factors. For a more detailed discussion of the conceptual differences between "employment" and "demand,"

See: Stevens, David W., Employment Projections for Planning Vocational-Technical Education Curricula: Mission Impossible?

36. For a review of issues related to the design and use of such establishment listings,

See: Sum, Andrew and Mazzeo, Katherine, Job Development Resource Guides for the Employment and Training System, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Policy and Evaluation Division, Boston, 1979.

37. For example,

See: i) Vinson, Robert and Harrington, Paul, Defining High Technology Industries in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, November 1979.

ii) Vinson, Robert and McKinnon, David, High Technology Employment Developments Within Selected Labor Market Areas in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, March 1980.

38. For a discussion of the use of staffing patterns data in the estimation of local unemployment rates by occupation,

See: Wool, Harold, "Some Analytical Shortcomings of Occupational Data on Employed and Unemployed Workers," Concepts and Data Needs, p. 553.

A discussion of staffing pattern data and new hires data is included in the following publication:

Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Occupational New Hire Study: The First Two Years, St. Paul, September 1979.

Discussions of staffing pattern data and job vacancy data by occupation can be found in the following two publications:

See: i) Harrington, Paul, The Labor Department's Experience in the Collection and Analysis of Job Vacancy Statistics: The Experimental Programs of 1964-66, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Forthcoming 1980;

ii) Office of Manpower and Employment Statistics, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Statement on the Occupational Employment Statistics Program, Washington, D.C., August 1971.

39. See: Office of Manpower and Employment Statistics, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Statement on the Occupational Employment Statistics Program, Washington, D.C., August 1971.

40. See: Harrington, Paul and Sum, Andrew, Issues Related to the Development and Use of Employer Surveys at the Local Level, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Forthcoming, 1980.

41. See: Sum, Andrew and Mazzeo, Katherine, Job Development Resource Guides for the Employment and Training System, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, Forthcoming 1980.

42. See: Doeringer, Peter B. and Piore, Michael J., Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis, D.C. Heath, Lexington, 1971.

43. See: Hall, Robert E. and Lillien, David M., "The Measurement and Significance of Labor Turnover," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 578-592.

44. See:
    i) Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Occupational New Hire Study: The First Two Years, St. Paul, September 1979, pp. 9, 29-36;
    ii) State of California, Employment Development Department, Employment Data and Research, Employment Service Potential: Special Survey of Employers, Volume III, Sacramento, September, 1979, particularly pages 1-36.

45. See: Armknecht, Paul A., "Comment on Hall and Lillien Paper," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 592-596.

46. For example,

    See:
    i) Solow, Robert, The Nature and Sources of Unemployment in the United States, Almquist, Stockholm, 1969;
    ii) Holt, Charles C. and David, Martin H., "The Concept of Job Vacancies in a Dynamic Theory of the Labor Market," The Measurement and Interpretation of Job Vacancy Statistics, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1966;
    iii) Perlman, Richard, "Comments on Frumerman's Report," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 638-40;
    iv) Sum, Andrew M., "Issues Related to the Purposes, Collection, Analysis, and Interpretation of Job Vacancy Data," Proceedings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Job Vacancy Statistics Conference, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., August, 1978.

47. See: Sum, Andrew M., The Basic Components of the Planning and Evaluation Functions for CETA Title One Programs at the State and Local Level, A Report Presented to the Employment and Training Administration, Boston, March 1977.

48. Substantial debate has occurred over the merits of conducting analysis of this type.

    See:
    i) Joseph, Myron, "Job Vacancy Measurement," The Journal of Human Resources, Summer 1966, pp. 66-69;

ii) Sharir, Shmuel, "On the Relationship Between Durations, Flows and Stocks of Unemployment and Vacancies: A Comment," The Journal of Human Resources, Fall 1971;

iii) Hall, Robert, "Comments on Frummerman's Report," in Job Vacancy Statistics in the United States, NCEUS Background Paper Number 3, Washington, D.C., May 1978;

iv) Bokan, Marianne and Harrington, Paul, "Preliminary Findings of the Massachusetts Pilot Job Openings Survey Project" in Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning, and Evaluation, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, April, 1980, pp. 339-392.

v) Sum, Andrew M., "Issues Related to the Purposes..." Op. Cit.

49. See: i) Sum, Andrew M., Labor Market Information Inputs for Local Manpower Planning and Evaluation, Northeastern University, 1976;

ii) Lecht, Leonard, "Occupational Projections for National, State, and Local Areas," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 509-534.

50. The demand by CETA prime sponsor planners for short-term projections of employment and expected job openings by occupation appears to be quite substantial. For example,

See: i) Vigeant, Paul, The Role of Establishment Surveys in the Policy Formulation Process, Paper Presented at the CLMS-MOICC Conference on Employer Surveys, Auburn, Massachusetts, February, 1980;

ii) Worcester Employment and Training Consortium, Employer Survey Overview: Thirteen High Net Demand Occupations, Worcester, July, 1979;

iii) Wisniowski, Howard, An Introduction to an Employer Survey, Hampden County Manpower Consortium, Springfield, Mass., February, 1980.

51. An exemplary document for counseling and guidance purposes based upon long-term projections at the state level has been produced by the state of Maine.

See: Manpower Research Division, Maine Department of Employment Security, Maine Occupational Outlook to 1985, Augusta, February, 1977.

52. For an example of such "targeted" short-term projections,

See: Coopers and Lybrand, Massachusetts High Technology Council Inc., Results of A Survey on Human Resource Needs, Boston, January 1980.

53. For a discussion of the limitations of long-term projections,

See: Martin, Rob, *Projecting the Demand for Labor in Massachusetts*, Draft Report of the Massachusetts Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, Forthcoming, 1980.

54. For example, the regulations governing the grant proposals of prime sponsors for funding under the STIP program mandated that assurances be given that the training programs funded would prepare participants for "high quality" jobs. The basic criteria employed by ETA determining whether a given occupation represented "high quality" employment was the starting wage rate.

See: i) McLaughlin, Francis M., "CETA and the Private Sector: The Skills Training Improvement Program in Massachusetts" in *Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning, and Evaluation*, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, March, 1980, pp. 43-80.

ii) Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Balance of State Prime Sponsor, "Skill Training Improvement Program (STIP) Grant Application," Boston, October 1977.

55. *See*: Dunlop, John T., "Job Vacancy Measures and Economic Analysis," *The Measurement and Interpretation of Job Vacancies*, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1966.

56. *See*: Barton, Paul E., "Youth Transition to Work: The Problem and Federal Policy Setting," in *From School to Work*: *Improving the Transition*, National Commission for Manpower Policy, Washington, D.C., April 1976.

57. *Ibid*., p. 9.

58. Preliminary efforts to develop occupational inventories of local entry-level jobs have been made by the Employment and Training Administration,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *Employer Information System*: *Draft Technical Assistance Guide*, Washington, D.C., Undated.

59. National Commission for Manpower Policy, "Corporate Hiring Practices," *From School to Work*: *Improving the Transition*, National Commission for Manpower Policy, Washington, D.C., April 1976.

60. *See*: Harrington, Paul and McLaughlin, Francis, *Implementation of the Skills Training Improvement Program*: *Training Electronic Test Technicians in the Medford Sub-grantee Area*, Research Report Prepared for the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, March 1980.

61. *See*: Brady, Elaine, et al., *An Evaluation of the Women in Construction Project of the Massachusetts Balance of State Prime Sponsor*, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Forthcoming, 1980.

62. See: McLaughlin, Francis and Harrington, Paul, A Process Evaluation of the Implementation of the Skills Training Improvement Program in Gardner, Massachusetts, Research Report Prepared for the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, February 1980.

63. In addition to the information on the seasonal pattern of new hires, CETA planners would also desirably have access to information on major new hire-ups within their local areas resulting from plant relocation, expansion on government contracts. Title VII legislation encourages the development of this type of data,

See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 705(a)(4)."

64. National Commission on Manpower Policy, "Corporate Hiring Practices," Op. Cit., p. 43.

65. The authors recognize that there are a number of additional sources of supply to an occupation, including OJT programs of employers, occupational mobility, geographic mobility, and re-entrants into the labor force; however, for CETA planning purposes, detailed estimates of the supply forthcoming from these sources are neither critical to the planning process nor are they feasible at this point in time. For a more detailed review of alternative sources of labor supply,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Supply: Concepts and Sources of Data for Manpower Analysis, Bulletin 1816, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974;

ii) Sommers, Dixie, "Occupational Supply Information and Planning for Education and Training," Paper presented to the North America Conference on Labor Statistics, Ottawa, Canada, July 1976;

iii) Meehan, Edward; Sum, Andrew; and Sawhney, P.K.; A Review and Critique of Alternative Methodologies for Estimating Labor Supply in Various Occupational Areas within State and Local Labor Markets, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, September 1976.

66. At a given point in time, the "supply" of labor for an occupation consists of both the number of persons employed in the occupation and the number of persons unemployed in that occupation. The "demand" for labor in that occupation consists of the number of employed persons and the number of available job openings in that occupation. Thus, an occupation can be considered to be in "shortage" only if the number of vacancies exceeds the number of unemployed persons. For a more detailed review of these concepts and their use in identifying occupational shortages,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Supply: Concepts and Sources of Data for Manpower Anaysis, pp. 308;

ii) Sum, Andrew M., Labor Market Information from A User's Perspective: Data Inputs for CETA Planning Purposes, pp. 42-46;

iii) Konstant, Raymond and Wingeard, F.O., "Analysis and Use of Job Vacancy Statistics," Monthly Labor Review, August 1968.

67. It is possible that some occupational labor markets will clear so rapidly through wage adjustments that shortages will not appear in the form of rising vacancy rates, but rather through rising relative wage rates. For a more detailed review of such possibilities,

See: i) Arrow, Kenneth J. and Capron, William M., "Dynamic Shortages and Price Rises: The Engineer Scientist Case," Quarterly Journal of Economics, May 1959, pp. 292-308;

ii) Folk, Hugh, Op. Cit.:

iii) Franke, Walter and Sobel, Irving, The Shortage of Skilled and Technical Workers, Heath-Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1970.

68. For a more detailed review of the unemployment-reducing potential of skills training programs in occupational shortage areas,

See: Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training Programs at the Local Level, Volume Two: The Use of Process, Outcome and Benefit-Cost Evaluation Techniques, pp. 249-262.

69. The comparisons of job vacancies and unemployed persons by occupation should occur on a major local labor area basis rather than on a prime sponsor planning area basis, particularly when the prime sponsors' planning area represents only a portion of a local labor area.

70. The calculations of these unemployment rates by occupation are dependent upon the existence of employment data by occupation on a local labor area basis. The employment and unemployment data must also be based upon the same occupational classification system, such as DOT or SOC codes.

71. The ES-202 industry employment data appearing in Table 3-2 would be the ideal data source for use in the calculation of insured unemployment rates for local labor areas and states.

72. Such information would have to be collected through personal interviews with the insured unemployed since the requisite data are not available on the claims cards of these individuals. For an example of such a study,

See: Cleary, Paul, and Sum, Andrew, Job Search Behavior, Job and Training Desires, and Reservation Wages of the Insured Unemployed in Lowell, Massachusetts, Policy and Evaluation Division, Department of Manpower Development, Boston, forthcoming, May 1980.

73. It should also be noted that a number of the active job applicants in the files of these offices may not be unemployed. Some of these applicants may be employed and seeking a change in employers or occupations. Others may be registered with the Job Service to comply with requirements for the continued receipt of food stamps or public assistance payments, such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Members of this latter group may not be actively seeking work and, thus, should be classified as "out of the labor force" rather than "unemployed."

74. These planning requirements were spelled out in Section 103 (a) of the 1978 CETA Amendments Act.

75. An example of such an inventory can be found in the following publication: *An Inventory of the Labor Market Supply Generated by Secondary and Post-Secondary Non-Professional Educational Institutions Within Massachusetts*, University of Lowell, Department of Economics, September 1977.

For a detailed discussion of the complexity of the issues involved in developing such an inventory,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Training Information in New England*: *An Evaluation*, Washington, D.C., 1978;

ii) LeCam, Christine, "The Role of Institutional Supply Data in the Development of an Occupational Information System," *Op. Cit*.

76. For a detailed description of the Office of Education's Program classification system,

See: National Center for Educational Statistics, *Standard Terminology for Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970.

77. *See*: 95th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 95-524*: *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978*, "Section 103 (a)(4) and (a)(7)."

78. For a more detailed discussion of some of the issues involved in conducting comprehensive occupational supply-demand matching,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Supply*: *Concepts and Sources of Data for Manpower Analysis*, pp. 3-8;

ii) Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; and Herrnstadt, Irwin; *Issues in the Development of a Comprehensive Occupational Information System ...*, pp. 21-38;

iii) LeCam, Christine, "The Role of Institutional Supply Data..."

79. Among the available products on statewide occupational supply-demand matching are the following:

i) LeCam, Christine and Sum, Andrew, A Description of the Methodology and Data Sources Used in Constructing the Preliminary Occupational Demand-Supply Table for the State of Massachusetts, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, 1978;

ii) Tarr, James R. and Campbell, Timothy A., Florida's Occupational Information and Delivery System, Office of Manpower Planning, Florida Department of Community Affairs, Tallahassee, October 1976;

iii) South Carolina Employment Security Commission, South Carolina Occupational Training Needs: A Demand and Supply Study for CETA Title I: South Carolina, Columbia, 1977.

80. For a detailed review of the CETA program reporting system and critiques of its usefulness in evaluating the performance of local CETA employment and training programs,

See: i) Beckley, Nancy, "The Development and Use of ETA's Short Term Indicators," paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor's CETA Title II Performance Measures Conference, Arlington, Virginia, February 1980;

ii) Dorrer, John, "Performance Measurement Issues: A Prime Sponsor Perspective," paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor's CETA Title II Performance Measures Conference, Arlington, Virginia, February, 1980;

iii) Zornitsky, Jeffrey, "The Use of Performance Indicators for Assessing CETA Title II Programs: A Critical Examination of the Performance Review Guidelines," paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor's CETA Title II Performance Measures Conference, Arlington, Virginia, February 1980;

iv) Stevens, David W., "Performance Measurement in the CETA System," CETA: An Analysis of the Issues, Special Report No. 2., National Commission for Manpower Policy, (May 1978), pp. 217-241.

81. The Act also mandated that the Secretary of Labor "develop standard definitions of 'enrollments', 'completions', 'job placement' and 'training-relation job placements'..."

See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Section 313 (g)(1)(A)."

82. The Policy and Evaluation Division of the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development has been engaged in a pilot project for the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee to develop formal methods for prime sponsors to report the occupational output of a selected number of their employment and training programs. The project is being conducted under the auspices of the Massachusetts State Occupational Information Coordination Committee. For a more detailed discussion of the objectives of this project,

See: LeCam, Christine, "The Role of Institutional Supply Data...," in Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning, and Evaluation, pp. 316-319.

83. The wage data currently provided by CETA prime sponsors to the Employment and Training Administration are available only in an aggregate distribution form. One cannot ascertain from these reports (Quarterly Summary of Participant Characteristics) the average hourly wage of all job placements or the average hourly wages of job placements from particular major training activities (classroom training, OJT) or individual training course; e.g., electronic technician, secretarial.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, particularly pp. III-51 to III-60.

84. For a recent review of the status of follow-up efforts of New England prime sponsors,

See: Sum, Andrew, Follow-up Evaluation Efforts of New England Prime Sponsors, a paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor's CETA Title II Performance Measures Conference, Arlington, Virginia, February 1980.

The questionnaires used in conducting the participant follow-up interviews for CETA Title II B Adult Programs appear in the following publication: Goldberg, Steven; Schneider, Glen; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; Data Collection Materials for Follow-up Evaluations of Title II B Adult Programs, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, January 1979.

85. A discussion of selected technical issues involved in estimating the earned incomes of CETA program participants in the follow-up period can be found in the following paper: Fleming, Martin, "Survey Methods and Data Sources for the Evaluation of Employment and Training Programs," paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Region I Evaluation Project Seminar, Natick, Massachusetts, February 1980.

86. Estimates of the net impacts of training programs upon the employability and earned income status of participants are dependent upon the availability of data for control groups or appropriate comparison groups. For a discussion of general issues involved in selecting such comparison groups and recent attempts of the national office of ETA to develop comparison groups for the CLMS follow-up survey,

See: i) Borus, Michael, Measuring the Impact of Employment-Related Social Programs, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1979;

ii) Brandwein, Seymour, "Long-Term DOL Performance Measurement," paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor Conference on CETA Title II Performance Measures, Arlington, Virginia, February 1980.

Chapter 4

Available Data Sources on Labor Force and Occupational Information for Local CETA Policymaking and Program Planning

Introduction

The previous chapter of this report was devoted to a detailed review and discussion of the primary labor force and occupational information needs of CETA prime sponsors for local policymaking and program planning purposes. This chapter will focus upon a detailed review and critical examination of available data and information sources that could be used to meet these previously-identified policymaking and planning needs of CETA prime sponsors. The review of available data sources will follow the table format of Chapter 3. Available population, labor force, incomes and earnings data will be reviewed in table 4-1. Sources of data on industrial and occupational employment at the state and local level and information on occupational characteristics will be reviewed in table 4-2. Occupational supply data sources will be examined in table 4-3A and 4-3B. Finally, data sources on the immediate and longer-term outputs of CETA employment and training programs will be reviewed in table 4-4. In addition to providing information on the geographic coverage frequency of availability, and primary characteristics of the information provided by these data sources, the tables will also contain a summary of the major shortcomings of each of these data sources for local CETA program planning purposes.[1] Recommendations for improving the usefulness of a selected number of these data sources will be presented in the concluding chapter of this report.

It should be noted that efforts to develop a comprehensive labor market information system at the national, state, and local level for use in planning CETA-related employment and training programs have been ongoing since the passage of the CETA legislation in 1973. The initial CETA Act of 1973 and the CETA reauthorization legislation of 1978 contained provisions calling for the development of comprehensive labor market information systems at the national, state, and local levels.[2] The Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor in cooperation with the State Employment Security Agencies has been involved in the development of a Labor Market

Information Program to meet the planning needs of CETA prime sponsors throughout the nation.[3] While substantive progress has been made in producing labor force and occupational information useful for planning and designing employment and training programs at the local level,[4] it must be recognized that important gaps in the system do remain. In the final chapter of this report, the authors will provide a series of recommendations for producing and making available to CETA prime sponsors the types of labor force and occupational information needed for policymaking and for effective strategic and operational planning.

Population Data

As noted in Chapter 3 of this report, CETA prime sponsor planners are required to provide a description and analysis of the demographic characteristics of their local populations in their master plans. The most comprehensive existing data source on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the population in prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas is that of the 1970 Census of Population and Housing.[5] The 1970 Census attempted to collect demographic data on the sex, age, racial/ethnic status, marital status, and household status of individuals in all households (and institutions) of the nation. The Census Bureau has published detailed profiles of the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the population for states, standard metropolitan statistical areas, counties, cities, and towns.[6] In addition, the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor developed a contract with the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory of the University of California to produce a series of reports on summary and detailed manpower indicators based on 1970 Census data for local labor areas, prime sponsor planning areas, and subgrantee areas.[7] These publications included detailed data on the age/sex/racial-ethnic characteristics of the 1970 populations in these areas as well as data on their labor force, employment and earnings status.

The major shortcoming of the 1970 Census data at this point in time is its lack of timeliness for CETA planning purposes. The data are now ten years old. In addition to the timeliness problems, the 1970 Census population data were also characterized by undercount problems, particularly for male members of racial minority groups.[8]

Table 4-1: Population, Labor Force, Income and Earnings Data Available for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Population	1970 Census of Population and Housing	States, standard metropolitan statistical areas, counties, cities, towns; selected tabulations for prime sponsor planning areas and subgrantee areas of balance of state prime sponsors	Once per decade	Data on total population in each of the areas under (B) and detailed data on age, sex, racial/ethnic, educational attainment, marital status, and household status of individuals	. Produced only once every ten years . Undercounts of minority groups . Unavailability of public use data tapes that can identify all prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas
	1976 Survey of Income and Education	States; selected standard metropolitan statistical areas: selected central cities	Spring of 1976 (One time survey)	Data on total non-institutional population in each of the areas under (B) and selected data on age, sex, racial/ethnic, educational attainment, marital status, and household status of individuals	. Only a one-time survey . Lack of geographic identifiers for most CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee areas . Limited sample size for racial/ethnic groups

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Population (cont.)	SESA updates of 1970 Census-based population data	States, major standard metropolitan statistical areas, most prime sponsor planning areas	Annual updates	Estimates of the total population in each of the areas under (B); estimates of the population by sex and in a limited number of age and racial/ethnic groups	. Uncertain accuracy of estimates . Lack of population estimates for subgrantee areas . Limited age, racial/ethnic breakouts . Lack of a micro-data base underlying calculations; thus, no cross-tabulations of data are feasible
Labor Force	Current Population Survey of households (CPS)	States, selected major standard metropolitan statistical areas, selected large central cities	Monthly data available only for ten largest states and two SMSA's; annual averages for states, major standard metropolitan statistical areas, selected large central cities	Estimates of the annual average size of the civilian labor force (16+); estimates of the size of the civilian labor force by sex and in a few age and race categories	. Lack of data for most prime sponsors and subgrantees . Limited age and racial/ethnic breakouts . Lack of information on socioeconomic characteristics of labor force participants . Lack of information on reasons for nonparticipation in labor force and barriers to active participation

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Labor Force (cont.)	Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS)	States, local labor areas, counties, prime sponsor areas, subgrantee areas, cities and towns	Monthly and annual average estimates	Estimates of the aggregate monthly and annual average level of the labor force in each of the areas under column (B)	. Questionable accuracy of monthly data . No information on demographic or socioeconomic characteristics of labor force participants
	SESA updates of the 1970 Census-based labor force data	States, major labor areas, prime sponsor planning areas	Annual	Estimates of the annual average level of the labor force and labor force participation rates for the total population (16+), for men and women, and for selected age and racial/ethnic groups in the areas under column (B)	. Unknown degree of accuracy of the estimates . Lack of estimates for subgrantee areas . Limited age and racial/ethnic breakouts . No information on socioeconomic characteristics of labor force participants . No information on job desires of nonparticipants or their barriers to active participation in the labor force
	1976 Survey of Income and Education	States, major SMSA's, selected large central cities	Spring of 1976 (one time survey)	Data on total civilian labor force and civilian labor force participation rate in	. Only a one-time survey . Lack of geographic identifiers for most CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee areas

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Labor Force (cont.)				each of the areas under (B); demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of labor force participants; job desires of nonparticipants and their reasons for not actively participating in the civilian labor force	. Limited sample size for racial/ethnic groups . Lack of information on nature of job desires of nonparticipants and perceived barriers to participation
Employment Data	Current Population Survey (CPS)	States, major SMSA's, selected large central cities	Monthly data only for 10 largest states and 2 SMSA's; annual average data for all states, major SMSA's, and selected large central cities	Estimates of the total annual average number of employed persons (16+) and the number of employed persons in selected age/sex/racial-ethnic groups; Estimates of number of persons employed full-time and part-time, including those employed part-time for economic reasons; Occupational distributions of employed persons for broad occupational groups	. Insufficient sample size and lack of geographic identifiers for most prime sponsor areas . Limited occupational detail and total absence of industrial detail in publications . Lack of earnings data for employed persons

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Employment Data (cont.)	Local Area Unemployment Statistics Program (LAUS)	States, labor areas, counties, prime sponsor and subgrantee areas, cities and towns	Monthly and annual average	Estimates of the aggregate number of employed persons on a monthly and annual average basis	. Questionable accuracy of estimates, particularly on a monthly basis . Lack of seasonal adjustment factors . No demographic or socioeconomic data on employed persons . No occupational or industrial detail
	SESA updates of 1970 Census-based employment estimates	States, major SMSA's, prime sponsor areas	Annual updates	Estimates of the aggregate number of employed persons and the number of employed persons in selected age/sex/racial-ethnic group; estimates of the annual average number of persons employed part-time for economic reasons by sex and race	. Unknown degree of accuracy of the estimates . Limited demographic detail and no estimates of socioeconomic characteristics of the employed . No occupational or industrial detail
	1976 Survey of Income and Education	States, major SMSA's, selected large central cities	Spring of 1976 (one time survey)	Estimates of the aggregate number of employed persons (16+) and the number of employed persons in sex, age, racial/	. Only a one-time survey . Lack of geographic identifiers for most CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee areas

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Employment Data (cont.)				ethnic groups; Additional detailed demographic and socioeconomic characteristics data; Occupational and industrial characteristics of jobs held; Part-time and full-time status of employed persons; Earnings from wage and salary employment in previous calendar year	. Lack of information on all jobs held during previous calendar year . Lack of data on hourly or weekly wages of jobs held at the time of the survey
Unemployment Data	Current Population Survey of Households (CPS)	States, large SMSA's, selected large central cities	Monthly data for 10 largest states and 2 SMSA's; annual averages for all areas under Column (B).	Estimates of annual average total number of unemployed persons (16+) and estimates of number of unemployed persons in selected age/sex/racial-ethnic groups; Annual average unemployment rates for each of the above groups; Distributions of the unemployed by the durations of their unemployment spells; Number of unemployed and unemployment rates in broad occupational categories	. Limited sample size and lack of geographic identifiers for most prime sponsor planning areas . Limited age breakouts; limited racial/ethnic data . Lack of data on socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed . Limited occupational detail and absence of published industrial detail

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Unemployment Data (cont.)	Local Area Unemployment Statistics Program (LAUS)	States, local labor areas, counties, prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas, cities and towns	Monthly and annual average estimates	Estimates of the aggregate number of unemployed persons and the overall unemployment rate in each of the areas under column (B)	. Questionable accuracy of the unemployment estimates, particularly on a monthly basis . Lack of seasonal adjustment factors . No information on the demographic or socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed
	SESA updates of the 1970 Census-based unemployment data	States, major SMSA's, prime sponsor planning areas	Annual updates	Estimates of annual average total number of unemployed persons, long-term unemployed persons, and the overall unemployment rate; estimates of the total number of different individuals with a spell of unemployment; estimates of the annual average number of unemployed and unemployment rates for selected age/sex/racial-ethnic groups	. Unknown degree of accuracy of the estimates . Lack of estimates for subgrantee areas . No information on socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed . Limited demographic data for the long-term unemployed . No occupational or industrial detail

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Unemployment Data (cont.)	1976 Survey of Income and Education	States, major SMSA's, and largest central cities	Spring of 1976 (one time survey)	Estimates of the total number of unemployed persons and the overall unemployment rate at the time of the survey; Estimates of the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed; Data on the durations of on-going unemployment spells; Number of unemployed and unemployment rates for occupational and industrial categories	. One time survey; . Lack of geographic identifiers for most CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee areas; . Limited data for racial/ethnic groups
	ES-203 report on the characteristics of the insured unemployed	Typically for states and major SMSA's; Variations in geographic detail among states	Monthly and annual averages	Estimates of the number of persons receiving U.I. benefits under regular state U.I. programs; Selected demographic data (age, sex, racial/ethnic data) on U.I. claimants; Selected data on durations of unemployment claims; Selected data on occupational and industrial attachment of insured unemployed	. Data pertain only to those unemployed receiving U.I. benefits . Lack of data for prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas Limited demographic data and no data on socioeconomic charteristics of U.I. claimants . Limited occupational detail

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Earnings and Income Data	Work Experience Survey (Supplement to the March CPS Survey)	States, major SMSA's, largest central cities	Annual	Estimates of the annual earnings and incomes of individuals in the previous calendar year; Data on the earnings and incomes of individuals in various demographic groups (age, sex, racial/ethnic); Annual earnings of workers in selected occupations and industries; Estimates of total household and family income in previous calendar year by source of income and by characteristics of family or household head	. Limited sample size has precluded publication of findings for states, SMSA's, and prime sponsor areas . Public use tapes do not contain geographic identifiers for most prime sponsor planning areas . Limited racial/ethnic data below national level . Biases in the annual income data reported by households
	1976 Survey of Income and Education	States, major SMSA's, and largest central cities	Spring of 1976 (one time survey)	Estimates of the annual earnings and incomes of individuals in calendar year 1975; Estimates of the annual earnings of individuals in various demographic groups and in selected occupations and industries; Estimates of total 1975 household and family income by character-	. One time survey . Limited sample size and lack of geographic identifiers for most prime sponsor planning areas . Limited racial/ethnic data . Underreporting of property and transfer income by households

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Earnings and Income Data (cont.)	Social Security Administration 1% Continuous Work History Sample (CWHS)	States and counties of employers	Annual	istics of family or household head; Estimates of the quarterly and annual pre-tax earnings of individuals from employment covered by the Social Security system; Earnings of workers by sex, age, and race; Earnings of workers by industry of employment (Social Security Administration industrial codes) and over their working lives	. Lack of geographic identifiers for cities and towns of employers on public use tapes . Time lags in the availability of public use tapes . Limited demographic data and no socio-economic characteristics data . Absence of occupational data for jobs held
Economically Disadvantaged	SESA updates of 1970 Census-based data	States, major SMSA's prime sponsor planning areas	Annual	Estimates of total number of economically disadvantaged persons (18+) and number of economically disadvantaged in racial/ethnic groups	. Unknown degree of accuracy of estimates . Limited demographic data . Absence of data on family, household, and labor force characteristics of the economically disadvantaged . Lack of information on labor force and employment problems of economically disadvantaged

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Economically Disadvantaged (cont.)	Employment Service Automated Reporting System (ESARS)	States, SMSA's, counties, Job Service local office areas	Monthly and cumulative yearly data	Total number and demographic characteristics of the economically disadvantaged registered with the Job Service; U.I. and public assistance status of the economically disadvantaged; occupational characteristics of the economically disadvantaged in the active file	. Provides data for only those economically disadvantaged registered with the Job Service . May lack geographic identifiers for prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas . Potential data purging problems . Limited data on labor force barriers of the disadvantaged . Lack of information on the job and training desires of the economically disadvantaged
	1976 Survey of Income and Education	States, large SMSA's, largest central cities	Spring of 1976	Data contained on micro-records of the public use tapes can be used to generate estimates of the total number and demographic characteristics of the economically disadvantaged; Estimates of the labor force status of the economically disadvantaged at the time of the survey and their labor force, employment,	. One time nature of the survey . Limited sample size and lack of geographic identifiers for prime sponsors and subgrantee planning areas . Income and earnings data pertain to previous calendar year only; lack of earnings data for most recent 3-6 month period

Table 4-1: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Available Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Availability	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Economically Disadvantaged (cont.)				and unemployment experiences during the previous calendar year; occupational and industrial characteristics of jobs held by the economically disadvantaged	

The availability of the population data from the 1980 Census should eliminate the problem of the lack of timeliness of the existing 1970 Census population data for prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas. The final chapter of this report will provide recommendations for the use of 1980 Census data for CETA planning purposes, including the generation by the Bureau of the Census of Public Use Tapes containing geographic identifiers for CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas.[9]

The 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE) also provided estimates of the noninstitutional populations of states, 119 standard metropolitan statistical areas, and 40-50 large central cities.[10] The population data pertain to the spring of 1976 when the survey was conducted.[11] Data on the demographic characteristics (sex, age, race, household status) of the noninstitutional populations in each of those areas are available from this survey although the published data from the survey have largely been confined to states.[12] The SIE's primary shortcomings for CETA planning purposes are the lack of geographic identifiers on the public use tapes for most CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee areas (due largely to overall sample size limitations) and the limited numbers of observations on racial/ethnic groups in most states that preclude detailed analysis of their labor force and income status.

The SESA's have also been engaged in efforts to provide updated estimates of the demographic characteristics of the populations of states, metropolitan areas, and prime sponsor planning areas based upon the Labor Market Projections Model of the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.[13] These efforts have produced annual updated estimates of the size of the population in selected age, sex, and racial groups in prime sponsor planning areas.[14] The accuracy of these population estimates is unknown at this time, and population estimates do not typically exist for subgrantee areas of balance of state prime sponsors.

Labor Force Data

Data collected by the Current Population Survey (CPS) do allow selected estimates to be made of the size and characteristics of the civilian labor force in states and a number of major standard metropolitan statistical areas.[15] The monthly data from the CPS household survey are currently used only to produce estimates of the aggregate size of the civilian labor force and the number of employed and unemployed persons in the ten largest states, the Los Angeles-

Long Beach SMSA and the city of New York.[16] Annual average civilian labor force data based upon the CPS are published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the states, 30 large SMSA's, and 11 large central cities in the BLS publication entitled Geographic Profiles of Employment and Unemployment.[17] The CPS-based annual average data on the size of the civilian labor force and civilian labor force participation rates are available for only a limited number of age/sex/race groups at the state and substate level. There is a complete absence of annual average civilian labor force data for the vast majority of prime sponsor planning areas and subgrantee areas. The available published labor force data on a state and substate basis do not provide any information on the socioeconomic characteristics of labor force participants, the reasons why nonparticipants are not actively seeking work, or the job desires of nonparticipants.

Labor force data for states, local labor areas, counties, CETA prime sponsor areas, and subgrantee areas are produced by the Local Area Unemployment Statistics program (LAUS) of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on a monthly and annual average basis.[18] The Federal/state cooperative program, however, only produces estimates of the aggregate size of the labor force in each of the above areas. The LAUS program is not capable of providing estimates of the demographic or socioeconomic characteristics of civilian labor force participants at the state or local level. In addition, the accuracy of the monthly labor force data is questionable, particularly for small substate areas.

The 1976 Survey of Income and Education did collect labor force data allowing for estimates of the aggregate size of the civilian labor force and the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of labor force participants for states, 119 major SMSA's, and 40-50 large cities.[19] The survey also collected data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of nonparticipants, the major reasons for their lack of active labor force participation, their job desires, and their future job seeking intentions.[20] The major shortcomings of the SIE survey data from a CETA planning perspective are the small sample sizes for most states that preclude the production of statistically reliable data for prime sponsor planning areas and the limited numbers of observations for racial/ethnic groups in most states.

The SESA's have produced annual average estimates of the total civilian labor force and selected age/sex/race characteristics of civilian labor force participants in standard metropolitan statistical areas and prime sponsor planning areas.[21] The estimates are based upon the Labor Market Projections Model (LMPM) of ETA and represent "projected" estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year. The accuracy of the labor force estimates are unknown at this time, and they suffer from limited demographic breakouts and a complete absence of data on the socioeconomic characteristics of participants; key data elements for the targeting of CETA employment and training resources.

Employment Data

Data on the numbers and characteristics of employed persons in states and substate areas are also available from the four data sources reviewed in the above section (CPS household survey, LAUS, SIE, and the SESA generated LMPM projections). Each of these data sources, however, provide either little or no data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the employed in prime sponsor planning areas.

The CPS currently is used to provide monthly estimates of the aggregate number of employed persons (16+) in only the ten largest states, the Los Angeles-Long Beach SMSA, and the city of New York. The CPS survey is also used to provide annual average estimates of the aggregate number of employed persons (16+) and the number of employed persons in selected age/sex/race groups for the states, the 30 largest SMSA's, and 11 large cities.[22] Estimates of the annual average number of persons employed full-time and part-time (with separate breakouts of those employed part-time for economic reasons) and of the occupational distribution of the employed are also available in the Geographic Profiles of Employment and Unemployment. The occupational employment categories, however, consist of ten major Census-based occupational groupings (professional and technical, managers and administrators, etc.) rather than detailed census occupations.

The annual average CPS employment data are quite limited for local CETA program planning purposes due to the absence of breakouts of the data for most prime sponsor planning areas, the limited demographic characteristics, the absence of data on the socioeconomic characteristics of the employed, the limited occupational detail in published data, and the absence of published data on the industry attachment of the employed.[23]

The LAUS system provides monthly and annual average estimates of the aggregate number of employed persons (16+) in states, local labor areas, counties, prime sponsor planning areas, and subgrantee areas of balance of state prime sponsors. The accuracy of the monthly employment estimates produced by the LAUS system, particularly for geographic areas with small populations, is questionable, and there are no seasonal adjustment factors for employment estimates for prime sponsor or subgrantee planning areas. The LAUS employment data provide no information on the demographic or socioeconomic characteristics of the employed in state and local areas or on their occupational and industrial attachment.

The data base for the 1976 Survey of Income and Education can be used to provide estimates of the aggregate number of employed persons (16+), their demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, and their industrial and occupational attachment for states, 119 SMSA's, and 40-50 central cities.[24] The SIE data can also be used to generate estimates of the number of persons employed part-time and full-time, to provide information on the voluntary and involuntary nature of part-time employment, and to produce estimates of the annual earnings and weeks of employment of workers in various occupations and industries.[25]

As noted above, the major shortcomings of the SIE for CETA planning purposes include the lack of geographic identifiers on the public use tapes for most CETA prime sponsor planning areas and the limited numbers of observations for members of racial/ethnic minority groups. The SIE survey also failed to collect data on the hourly or weekly wages of jobs held by persons who were employed at the time of the survey.

The final source of data on the number of employed persons in SMSA's and prime sponsor planning areas is that of the SESA projections based upon the LMPM model. These projections provide annual average estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year of the number of employed persons in selected age/sex/race groups.[26] The degree of accuracy of these estimates is not known. They also provide few details on the demographic characteristics of employed persons and completely fail to provide any information on the socioeconomic characteristics of the employed or their occupational and industrial attachment.

Unemployment Data

Data on the numbers and/or the characteristics of the unemployed in states and substate areas of the nation are available from a variety of different sources; however, most of these sources fail to provide estimates of the numbers or characteristics of the unemployed in CETA prime sponsor or subgrantee planning areas. The CPS household survey currently is used only to produce monthly estimates of the aggregate number of unemployed persons (16+) in the 10 largest states, the Los Angeles-Long Beach SMSA, and the city of New York. Annual average estimates of the aggregate number of unemployed persons (16+), the overall unemployment rate, and the number of unemployed persons in a limited number of age/sex/race groups are available for all states, 30 large SMSA's, and 11 large central cities. Estimates of the number of unemployed workers and unemployment rates for workers in broad occupational groups are also available on an annual basis for the above areas. In addition, the Geographic Profiles also provide annual average data on the distributions of the unemployed in a number of the above areas by the durations of their ongoing unemployment spells and the reasons for their unemployment; i.e., job loser, job leaver, etc.[27]

Monthly and annual average data on the aggregate number of unemployed persons (16+) and the overall unemployment rate are available for states and substate areas from the LAUS program.[28] This Federal-state cooperative statistical program provides monthly aggregate unemployment estimates for local labor areas, prime sponsor planning areas, subgrantee areas of balance of state prime sponsors, counties, cities, and towns. These monthly data are utilized to not only track aggregate unemployment developments in prime sponsor planning areas, but also to allocate national CETA program monies among prime sponsors.[29]

The LAUS unemployment estimates for substate areas have been subject to widespread criticism, particularly with respect to the accuracy of the monthly unemployment data which are used as inputs into national CETA allocation formulas.[30] The monthly LAUS unemployment data for substate areas also lack seasonal adjustment factors. From a CETA planning perspective, the most serious shortcomings of the LAUS unemployment data is their complete inability to provide any information on the demographic socioeconomic, industrial, occupational characteristics of the unemployed within CETA prime sponsor planning areas.[31] The LAUS unemployment data, thus, cannot be used to identify the characteristics of the locally unemployed or to assist in the determination of the numbers and characteristics of CETA-eligible individuals within prime sponsor planning areas.

The 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE) collected data from households that allow for estimates to be made of the numbers and the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the unemployed in states, 119 major standard metropolitan statistical areas, and approximately the largest 40 central cities of the nation.[32] Data on the occupational and industrial attachment of the unemployed, their reasons for being unemployed, and the durations of their current unemployment spells were also collected during the survey. These data can be utilized to estimate unemployment rates of workers by broad occupational and industrial category and to identify the numbers and the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the long-term unemployed.[33] Data on the demographic characteristics of the unemployed, the durations of their spells of unemployment, and their annualized family incomes are critical to the determination of the numbers and characteristics of individuals eligible for participation in CETA employment and training programs, particularly Title II D and VI PSE programs.

The SIE survey's limitations for local CETA program planning include the one-time nature of the survey, the lack of geographic identifiers on the public use tapes for most prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas, and limited observations on racial/ethnic minority groups for most states and substate areas.

The SESA's have utilized the Labor Market Projections Model (LMPM) to develop projected estimates of annual average unemployment levels and rates for states, SMSA's, and prime sponsor planning areas. Unemployment levels and rates are projected for all persons (16+) and for persons in selected age/sex/racial-ethnic groups.[34] The projected unemployment estimates are published by the SESA's in the Annual Planning Information Reports.

Information on the accuracy of the unemployment projections produced by the SESA's is not available at this time.[35] The estimates currently do not provide any information on the socioeconomic characteristics (family or household income) of the unemployed or on their occupational and industrial attachment.

The final major source of data on the characteristics of the unemployed in state and local areas is that of the administrative records on unemployment insurance claimants.[36] Data contained on the claims cards of U.I. recipients can be used by CETA planners to develop demographic, occupational, and industrial profiles of the insured unemployed in states and substate areas, including prime sponsor planning areas and subgrantee areas.[37]

Data on the characteristics of the insured unemployed in states and major SMSA's have been produced by the SESA's under the ES-203 program.[38] The ES-203 is a Federal-state cooperative program that provides monthly estimates of the characteristics of those unemployment insurance claimants receiving benefits under the regular state unemployment insurance programs.[39] The data provided by this survey are generated by the SESA's typically on the basis of a monthly survey of a sample of unemployment insurance claim cards. The size of the sample tends to differ from state to state, varying from one percent to 100 percent representation.[40] The details of the U.I. claimants data produced by the State Employment Security Agencies also differ somewhat from state to state, but generally include breakdowns on the age and sex composition, industry and occupational attachment, and duration of current spell of unemploy-ent of existing U.I. claimants.[41]

The ES-203 survey data are, however, typically characterized by several key shortcomings from a CETA program planning perspective. Since the data are frequently generated on the basis of sampling techniques, the data are often published only at the state level and occasionally at the major SMSA level. Most CETA program planning is, however, conducted at a substate and sub-SMSA level; therefore, the usefulness of these data is somewhat diminished. Second, in most cases, these data are often not published in enough detail for planning purposes. For example, the ES-203 survey in Massachusetts has typically provided an age/sex breakdown of the insured unemployed by the duration of their current spell of unemployment; however, the age groupings consist of only the following two categories: those under 45 years of age and those 45 and over. To be effective for prime sponsor planning purposes, these data would have to be disaggregated into more detailed age categories, such as 16-19, 20-24, 25-34 etc. Finally, the ES-203 survey provides information only on unemployment insurance claimants under regular state U.I. programs. The overall coverage of this group relative to the entire unemployed population tends to vary over time, rising in times of increasing unemployment and falling in times of economic expansion.[42] During the 1970's, the annual average number of insured unemployed under regular state U.I. programs have tended to account for approximately 42 percent of the total annual average number of unemployed throughout the nation.[43] This ratio tended to vary from year to year as overall economic conditions changed, ranging from a high of 51 percent in 1975 to a low of 37.9 percent in 1973 during the 1972-78 period. During any given year, the proportion of the annual average total estimated number of unemployed that consists of U.I. claimants tends to vary substantially among the states as a result of variations in labor market conditions, U.I. laws, and U.I. administrative procedures. The findings in table 4-1A reveal the variations in these proportions among the states in 1978. During that year, the insured unemployed under regular state U.I. programs accounted for 39 percent of the annual average total number of unemployed throughout the nation. This ratio varied from highs of 74.8 percent to 67 percent for Rhode Island and Alaska to lows of 19.9 percent and 20.1 percent in Texas and Virginia.

The U.I. claimants data can potentially serve as an effective data base for identifying the characteristics of unemployed job losers in prime sponsor planning areas. A number of recommendations for changes in the collection, processing, and publication of U.I. claimants data will be provided in the final chapter. These suggestions are primarily intended to improve the utility of existing U.I. claimants data for CETA program planning purposes.

Annual Earnings and Incomes Data

As noted in Chapter 3 of this report, data on the annual earnings of workers and the annual incomes of families and households in prime sponsor planning areas would be useful for both identifying the numbers and characteristics of individuals potentially eligible for participation in various CETA programs and for selecting occupations and industries upon which to focus training efforts. Data on the annual earnings of workers and the annual incomes of families and households are available from a number of different sources; however, these data typically suffer from a number of shortcomings from CETA program planning purposes. Three data sources (the March CPS survey and its supplement, the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, and the Social Security Administration's Continuous Work History Sample are reviewed in table 4-1.[44] A brief summary of their major features and their strengths and weaknesses from a CETA program planning perspective are discussed below.

The March CPS survey contains an annual supplement designed to capture information on the work experiences, earnings, and incomes of individuals (14+) in the previous calendar year.[45] The data collected through the use of this

Table 4-1A: Estimates of the Total Number of Unemployed and the Number of Insured Unemployed Under State U.I. Programs, by State: 1978

State	(A) Number of Unemployed (In Thousands)	(B) Number of Insured Unemployed (In Thousands)	(C) Insured Unemployed As Percent of Total Unemployed
Alabama	101.0	35.6	.352
Alaska	20.0	13.4	.670
Arizona	61.0	14.0	.230
Arkansas	58.0	22.1	.381
California	755.0	310.1	.411
Colorado	71.0	17.0	.239
Connecticut	79.0	37.9	.478
Delaware	21.0	6.7	.319
D.C.	28.0	10.1	.361
Florida	245.0	59.0	.241
Georgia	131.0	37.5	.286
Hawaii	31.0	10.5	.339
Idaho	23.0	9.0	.391
Illinois	323.0	149.7	.463
Indiana	146.0	32.6	.223
Iowa	57.0	22.8	.400
Kansas	35.0	13.5	.386
Kentucky	82.0	32.7	.399
Louisiana	113.0	32.7	.289
Maine	29.0	14.5	.500
Maryland	114.0	33.3	.292
Massachusetts	173.0	77.6	.449
Michigan	289.0	127.5	.441
Minnesota	76.0	30.8	.405
Mississippi	68.0	17.4	.256
Missouri	114.0	50.6	.444
Montana	22.0	9.1	.414
Nebraska	23.0	8.2	.357
Nevada	15.0	7.8	.520

Table 4-1A: (continued)

State	(A) Number of Unemployed (In Thousands)	(B) Number of Insured Unemployed (In Thousands)	(C) Insured Unemployed As Percent of Total Unemployed
New Hampshire	16.0	4.3	.269
New Jersey	246.0	116.9	.475
New Mexico	30.0	8.8	.293
New York	603.0	260.7	.432
North Carolina	116.0	37.4	.322
North Dakota	14.0	5.7	.407
Ohio	267.0	87.5	.323
Oklahoma	49.0	12.4	.253
Oregon	72.0	31.6	.439
Pennsylvania	364.0	185.0	.508
Puerto Rico	175.0	56.2	.321
Rhode Island	29.0	21.7	.748
South Carolina	74.0	20.7	.280
South Dakota	10.0	3.5	.350
Tennessee	110.0	42.3	.385
Texas	288.0	57.3	.199
Utah	21.0	9.3	.443
Vermont	14.0	5.9	.421
Virginia	130.0	26.1	.201
Washington	120.0	48.0	.400
West Virginia	46.0	22.6	.491
Wisconsin	118.0	45.1	.382
Wyoming	7.0	1.5	.214

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, "Table D-4," p. 339, and "Table D-5," p. 340.

supplement (known as the Annual Demographic Supplement) are also used to generate estimates of the total incomes of households and families throughout the nation as well as information on the sources of those incomes (wage and salary earnings, dividends, rents, retirement income, public assistance, etc.).[46] The data from the Annual Demographic Survey are used by the Bureau of the Census to produce estimates of the annual earnings and incomes of workers in various age, sex, racial/ethnic, occupational, and industrial groups.[47]

The annual earnings and income data from the March CPS survey and its supplement are characterized by a number of shortcomings from a local CETA program planning perspective. First, the limited sample sizes for most states have precluded the publication by the Bureau of the Census of annual estimates of workers earnings and incomes of households and families for states.[48] Second, while the public use tapes containing the CPS and the data from the March Annual Demographic Supplement do include geographic identifiers for states, these tapes do not contain geographic identifiers for the vast majority of prime sponsor planning areas. Third, the number of observations on minority persons and households (key CETA target groups) for individual states is typically far too small to allow for any detailed statewide analysis to be conducted of the labor force, employment, and earning's problems of these subgroups of the population.

The 1976 Survey of Income and Education collected data on the earnings and incomes of respondents (14+) during the previous calendar year, i.e., 1975. These data do allow estimates to be made of the annual earnings of workers in various demographic subgroups and in major industries and occupations.[49] In addition, the data can be used to derive estimates of the annual incomes of households and families in each of the geographic areas identified on the SIE survey's public use tapes and to determine the numbers and characteristics of poor persons and families living in those areas.[50] The work experience data for household and family heads can be combined with data on their annual total household and family income to assess the sources of the income inadequacy of economically disadvantaged households and families; i.e., low labor force participation, high unemployment, intermittent employment, and low weekly wages.[51]

As noted above, the SIE data base has a number of major strengths from a CETA planning perspective. Its major limitations are primarily related to the one-time nature of the survey (Spring 1976), the somewhat limited sample sizes for many states, and the lack of geographic identifier codes for most prime sponsor planning areas on the public use tapes.

The Continuous Work-History Sample (CWHS)

The Continuous Work-History Sample (CWHS) is a longitudinal employee earnings reporting system based upon employer records and administered by the Social Security Administration. The data base consists of a 1-100 random sample of workers who are employed in establishments covered by the nation's Social Security system.[52] The files of te CWHS system contain earnings data on approximately one million workers. Earnings data for these workers are provided quarterly to the Social Security Administration by employers covered by the Social Security contributions system. In recent years, employees in establishments covered by the Social Security system have accounted for approximately 90 percent of all wage and salary employees in the U.S. economy.[53]

The CWHS data file is characterized by a number of potential strong points from a CETA program planning and local labor market research point of view. Among these strengths are the following:

(i) The number of persons for whom earnings information exists on the file is approximately one million. This sample size is approximatey 12 x as large as the number of persons (16+) with work experience (in the previous calendar year) who were interviewed during the March 1977 Work Experience Survey;[54]

(ii) The CWHS data file contains estimates of the annual pre-tax earnings of persons from employment in establishments covered by the Social Security system. These earnings data are longitudinal in nature and are available for an individual every year from the date that he or she was initially brought into the sample. Since these earnings data are provided by employers, they are believed to be more accurate than those that are derived from household surveys, particularly those types of surveys that obtain earnings information from persons in households other than the individual to whom the earnings data apply;

(iii) The CWHS data file also provides information on the industries in which these individuals earned their income during each quarter of the year. The industry detail available from this survey is substantially greater than that from most household surveys, including the Current Population Survey.

Some additional information on the characteristics of the establishments in which workers were employed, including the number of employees within the establishment, is also available from this data file. Specific establishments cannot, however, be identified from the CWHS data file since the Social Security Administration assigns control numbers to employers that are different from their actual employer identification number;

(iv) The CWHS data can be utilized to derive estimates of the length of time (in quarters of years) that individual employees in the sample have been attached to a particular establishment or industry. These data can then be used to construct experience-earnings profiles for workers by industry. Findings with respect to the steepness (or lack thereof) of these experience-earnings profiles by industry would be highly useful in identifying industries that are likely to be major providers of "primary" jobs, key candidates for CETA institutional skill and OJT training programs.[55]

The CWHS data base does, however, suffer from a number of current shortcomings that limit, in several substantive, ways its usefulness for planning local CETA employment and training programs. Among the more serious shortcomings of this data base as it exists at the current time are the following;

(i) The CWHS data file only contains information on the age, sex, and race of individuals in the sample. The data base does not contain any information on other personal characteristics of workers, such as their marital status and their household status, or on any of their human capital attributes, such as the number of years of formal educational attainment or their formal training backgrounds;

(ii) The survey data cannot provide any information on the labor force status of persons during any given year. The data can only be used to determine whether or not an individual received earnings from a covered employer during a given quarter of the year. The CWHS data base does not provide any information on weeks of employment during the quarter or hours per week of employment;

(iii) No information is available on the unemployment experiences of workers during any given year or on periods of time that they spent out of the labor force. Thus, the CWHS data base provides no insights into reasons for less than full-time, year round employment of workers;

(iv) The CWHS data base does not contain any information on the occupations or jobs held by those in the sample over their working lives. While information is provided on the industries in which jobs were held, no other information (with the exception of the employment size code noted above) on the characteristics of establishments in which jobs are held is contained in the data file;

(v) The CWHS data base only contains earnings information for workers employed in establishments covered by the Social Security System. As noted above, approximately 10 percent of all wage and salary employment, primarily in state and local government units, is not covered by the Social Security contributions regulations. As a result, the total annual earnings of workers who were employed at some time during a year in a noncovered establishment will be underestimated on the CWHS data file. The existence of a zero covered earnings figure for any given quarter does not automatically imply a lack of employment of an individual during that quarter;

(vi) Those workers who reach the maximum taxable earnings limit prior to the end of the calendar year must have their earnings for the remainder of the year estimated by the Social Security Administration. In recent years, approximately 20 percent of the workers in the sample have obtained earnings above the maximum.[56] The Social Security Administration has developed a method known as the quarter-limit estimating technique for generating annual earnings estimates for such workers.[57]

Given the above shortcomings, the CWHS data base is not currently capable of allowing one to identify the characteristics of individuals eligible for participation in CETA programs, to trace the occupational mobility of workers over their working lives, or to develop an understanding of the factors influencing the occupational or relative earnings mobility process. While some of the existing research work based on this data system has proven useful in highlighting some of the key dimensions of relative earnings mobility for individual workers in the American economy, it has not been able to provide the detailed insights into the nature of the mobility process that are needed by local CETA policymakers and program administrators.[58]

The Economically Disadvantaged

The 1978 CETA reauthorization legislation placed a major emphasis upon the delivery of employment and training services to the economically disadvantaged. In developing their annual plans, prime sponsors must have access to data on the numbers and characteristics of the economically disadvantaged in their local planning areas to assist them in determining the characteristics of individuals eligible for various CETA programs.[59] The concept of "economically disadvantaged" as developed by the U.S. Department of Labor is one that has undergone a number of changes during the past twelve years when it was first introduced by the Manpower Administration to assist in the operations of the NAB-JOBS program.[60] Partly as a result of the revisions in the concept of "economically disadvantaged," there is no historical data series and little substantive published data on the size and characteristics of the economically disadvantaged at the national, state, or local level. One can, however, utilize data from a number of existing household and administrative data bases to derive selected estimates of the numbers and characteristics of the economically disadvantaged populations in state and selected substate areas. Several such data bases are listed in table 4-1.

The public use tapes containing data from the national March CPS and Annual Demographic Supplement could be used to estimate the numbers and characteristics of the economically disadvantaged in each state throughout the nation and in those substate areas identified on the tapes.[61] The individual demographic, socioeconomic, and labor force data contained in these files would be particularly useful in identifying the characteristics of the economically disadvantaged, their labor force status at the time of the survey, and their work experiences during the previous calendar year.[62] The March CPS data are, however, limited in their usefulness for local CETA program planning purposes. These limitations are primarily due to the limited number of households (i.e., 1,000-2,600) interviewed in most states during the survey and the lack of geographic identifiers for most prime sponsor planning areas on the public use tapes.

The public use tapes from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education provide a comprehensive and relatively rich source of data on individual, household, and family income levels and sources for states and large SMSA's. This data base can be used together with data on area BLS lower living budget levels to generate estimates of the total number of economically disadvantaged individuals and families in states and SMSA's.[63] The demographic and labor force data contained on these tapes can be utilized in conjunction with the household and family income data to generate estimates of the numbers and characteristics of individuals potentially eligible for participation in various CETA programs.[64]

The SIE data are limited in terms of their usefulness for identifying the numbers and characteristics of the economically disadvantaged in prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas. The limitations are largely the result of the lack of geographic identifiers on the public use tapes for prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas. The absence of geographic identifiers for such CETA planning areas is largely due to the limited number of observations for many of the CETA planning areas and to the nature of the survey itself; i.e., its primary intended purpose of producing statistically reliable estimates of the numbers of school-aged children living in poverty families in each state of the nation.

The State Employment Security Agencies have utilized the LMPM model to project the number of economically disadvantaged individuals residing in states, SMSA's, and CETA prime sponsor planning areas.[65] These projections are only prepared for the total economically disadvantaged population (18+) and for whites, blacks, Spanish, and other nonwhites. No other information on the demographic, socioeconomic, or labor force characteristics of the economically disadvantaged is provided. Thus, the projected estimates cannot be used to determine the numbers and characteristics of individuals eligible for participation in CETA employment and training programs.

The final source of published data on the economically disadvantaged at the state and substate level is that of the Employment Security Automated Reporting System (ESARS).[66] The ESARS system produces a wide range of reports on the operations of the state Job Service, including the numbers and characteristics of applicants, the types of services provided to applicants, the numbers and characteristics of job placements, and the numbers and characteristics of active applicants in the files of the Job Service offices.

Information on the numbers and characteristics of economically disadvantaged applicants are available in several ESARS tables. Table B06 provides information for the state as a whole on the cumulative number of economically disadvantaged applicants, the number of new and renewed economically disadvantaged applicants, and the number of economically disadvantaged individuals in the active file at the end of the reporting period as well as information on selected demographic, socioeconomic, and labor force characteristics of the above three groups.[67] Table 96 of ESARS provides statewide information on the occupational characteristics (3-, 6-, or 9-digit DOT Code) of all individual applicants and of economically disadvantaged applicants in the active file. From a local CETA program planning perspective, the most useful table for identifying the numbers and characteristics of the economically disadvantaged is Table 93. This table entitled the Characteristics of the Active File provides cross-tabulations data on the characteristics of applicants in the active file, including separate breakouts of the economically disadvantaged, by county.[68] To the extent that a CETA prime sponsor's boundaries coincide closely with those of counties, the data contained in Table 93 could provide a valuable source of information on the numbers and characteristics of the locally economically disadvantaged population.

The ESARS data currently suffer from a number of shortcomings from a CETA program planning perspective. First, there is little empirical evidence on the degree of the coverage and representativeness of the ESARS data on the economically disadvantaged at the national, state, and local level. Knowledge of the proportion of the local economically disadvantaged both in the aggregate and for selected age, sex, racial/ethnic groups, that apply to the Job Service is crucial for determining the representativeness of the data and, thereby, its usefulness in targeting local CETA resources. The representativeness of the ESARS data is, however, likely to vary by age and sex group.[69] Second, as noted earlier, the detailed cross-tabulated data on the characteristics of economically disadvantaged applicants are currently routinely produced on a county level basis. Those CETA prime sponsors that consist of either only a portion of a county (a city prime sponsor) or parts of several different counties (balance of state prime sponsors) will find the published ESARS data somewhat limited in usefulness. These shortcomings can be addressed at least in part by obtaining the state Master Applicant Files for ESARS and producing tables similar to that of Table 93 for local office areas, prime sponsor areas, and subgrantee planning areas.[70] A more detailed discussion of the role of revised ESARS table formats in facilitating the local CETA planning process will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Finally, the ESARS system currently does not contain all of the data on an individual applicant that is necessary for determining the eligibility of that applicant for participation in various CETA programs. For example, the application forms used by the Job Service do not currently collect information that is capable of distinguishing whether an applicant is unemployed or out of the labor force nor does it collect information on the durations of on-going unemployment spells of job applicants.[71] ETA has, however, recently developed a methodology utilizing both ESARS data and SIE data to estimate the sex, age, and racial/ethnic distribution of the CETA eligible population by Title in prime sponsor planning areas.[72] The methodology is currently being utilized to produce such estimates for use by prime sponsor planners in their FY 81 program planning efforts.

Available Data Sources on Industry Employment, Occupational Employment, and Occupational Characteristics

Table 3-2 of the previous chapter summarized the needs of CETA planners and policymakers with respect to industry and occupational employment data, other demand-related occupational data, and information on occupational characteristics. Available data sources for each of these items are identified in table 4-2, including a brief description of their geographic coverage, frequency of availability, primary characteristics, and major shortcomings from a local CETA program planning perspective.

Industry Employment Data

Data on the level and structure of industry employment at the state and local level are available from a number of different sources. The two most useful sources of industry employment data for CETA program planning purposes are the BLS-SESA establishment survey of nonagricultural wage and salary employment and the State Employment Security Agencies ES-202 survey of employment in establishments covered by the Federal and state U.I. laws.[73]

The BLS-SESA establishment survey (also known as the BLS-790 survey) is a Federal-state cooperate statistical program designed to produce estimates of the levels of nonagricultural wage and salary employment for the nation, states, and selected local labor areas.[74] The monthly survey is based on a sample of establishments in each state and is utilized to produce monthly and annual average estimates of the levels of nonagricultural wage and salary employment in the aggregate and for selected 1- and 2-digit industries for states and major labor areas within states.[75]

Table 4-2: Available Industry Employment Data and Occupational Information for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning

Types of Data or Information	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Shortcomings of Data
Industry Employment Data	BLS-790 survey of nonagricultural wage and salary employment	States and major labor areas	Monthly and annual averages	Estimates of total nonagricultural wage and salary employment and wage and salary employment for selected 2-digit and 1-digit SIC industries	. Unavailability of data for all labor areas; lack of industry detail; preliminary estimates subject to later revisions; lack of seasonal adjustment factors
	ES-202 reports on covered employment	States, labor areas, cities and towns	Annual averages published; quarterly employment data available in unpublished form	Estimates of employment covered by the Federal and state U.I. laws by industry; employment estimates for 2-digit and 3-digit SIC industries	. Geographic coding problems; breaks in historical employment trends due to SIC code revisions and noneconomic changes; confidentiality problems in release of data
Major Local Employers	ES-202 listings of establishments covered by the Federal and state U.I. laws	States, major labor areas, cities and towns	Typically available for first quarter of each calendar year	Names, address listings and employment size-classes of establishments by 3-digit SIC codes	. Lags in listings of new establishments; geographic coding; and confidentiality issues affecting release of such information
	Industrial directories	States, cities and towns	Varies	Varies; often limited to firms within the manufacturing sector	. Variable and incomplete industry coverage; lack of data on employment size

Table 4-2: (Continued)

Types of Data or Information	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Shortcomings of Data
Occupational Staffing Pattern Data	1970 Census of the population	State, major labor areas	Once every 10 years; can be updated using national adjustment factors	Provides estimates of occupational employment in the aggregate and by industry; use of census occupational classification system	. Potential errors in data due to respondent bias in reporting occupational status . Lack of timeliness . Lack of detail in occupational coverage . Occupational classification system does not reflect skills actually employed by workers on the job
	BLS-SESA Occupational Employment Statistics Survey (OES)	States; selected major metropolitan areas	Once every three years for an industry	Provides estimates of employment by detailed industry and occupation based on sample of business establishments	. Lack of time series data in staffing patterns due to revision in classification system . General unavailability of data at the substate level . Lack of published detail due to sample size, confidentiality and publications criteria

Table 4-2: (Continued)

Types of Data or Information	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Shortcomings of Data
Labor Turnover and Accessions Data					
(i) Labor Turnover Data	BLS-SESA Labor Turnover Survey Program (LTS)	Statewide, major metropolitan areas	Monthly and annual averages	Information on total accessions, new hires, total separations, quits, and lay-offs, by 1-and 2-digit SIC industry for manufacturing	. Accuracy of estimates has not been ascertained; concern with downward bias . Insufficient industrial and geographic detail . No data on occupational or wage characteristics of new hires
	Employment Service Potential Projects of SESA's (ESP)	Statewide, selected substate areas	Quarterly and annual totals	Data on total accessions, estimates of new hires, and data on total separations by 2-digit and 3-digit SIC industry group	. Unavailability of data base for all states . Lack of information on types of separations . Problems in identifying geographic locations of new hires . Absence of information on occupational or wage characteristics of new hires

Table 4-2: (Continued)

Types of Data or Information	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Shortcomings of Data
Labor Turnover and Accessions Data					
(ii) Occupational New Hires Data	Irregular SESA surveys	Typically statewide when available	Varies	Estimates of the number of new hires by occupation, estimates of new hire rates for selected occupations	. Lack of regular availability . Lack of information on characteristics of those hired, wages on new hires, or hiring requirements for such jobs
Job Vacancy Data	(i) Help-wanted advertising data	Varies	Varies	Data produced generally refer to total number of ads during a given time period, with selected major occupational breakouts occasionally	. Incapable of producing information on the level and the geographic, industrial, and occupational structure of unfilled job openings. Wage data incomplete or missing; . Information from such studies may be quite misleading as to actual availability of such openings
	(ii) Job Bank, job openings data	States and local labor areas	Monthly, cumulative annual totals	. Tabulations of end of month. Unfilled job orders placed with the Job Services by employ-	. Data are not comparable with existing data on employment and unemployment

Table 4-2: (Continued)

Types of Data or Information	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Shortcomings of Data
Job Vacancy Data				ers, with selected data on the industry, occupation, and wage rates of job openings . Cumulative data on the total number of job openings received and filled during the year are also available, with selected breakouts by broad occupational group, agricultural vs. nonagricultural status, expected duration of job, and hourly wages	. Data only represent some unknown fraction of total available job openings in state and local labor areas . Industrial and occupational distribution of Job Bank job openings may differ sharply from actual distributions of total openings
	(iii) BLS-SESA Pilot Job Openings Survey Program (JOS)	Statewide in four cooperating states	Designed to produce quarterly estimates	Designed to produce data on the estimated level and industrial and occupational composition of current job openings throughout the state	. No data have been produced by the program to date; . Existing sample size precludes production of estimates at sub-state levels; . Uncertainty of future funding for the program

Table 4-2: (Continued)

Types of Data or Information	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Shortcomings of Data
Projections of Industry and Occupational Employment for States and Local Labor Areas					
(i) Short-term Projections (1-2 years)	Ad hoc state efforts	Typically statewide	Varies	Typically provides statewide estimates of projected industry wage and salary employment on a 1-digit and 2-digit SIC basis over a one to two year period	. Lack of industry detail . Lack of local detail . Typically not designed to provide projected estimates of employment in specific industry/ occupation job clusters
(ii) Long-term Projections	BLS-SESA state and area occupational projections program	Statewide and major metropolitan areas; selected substate educational planning regions	Varies; typically every three years for states	. Projections of future levels of industry and occupational employment and annual average numbers of job openings by occupation over a 5-9 year time period; . Two types of occupational employment projections currently exist; i.e., those generated by the Census-	. Infrequent updates and unknown accuracy of industry employment projections; . Infrequent updates of the labor force separation rates used in estimating replacement demand; . Inability of distinguishing between job openings that will be filled from within firms by incum-

Table 4-2: (Continued)

Types of Data or Information	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Shortcomings of Data
				based matrix and those generated by the OES survey-based matrix. Occupational classification systems used in these two surveys, thus, will differ from one another.	bent employees and those that will be open to outsiders at ports of entry
Wage Rates and Weekly Hours Data for Occupations					
	(i) BLS occupational pay and supplementary benefits program	Selected metropolitan areas of the nation	Annual survey	Provides data on average hourly and weekly wages paid to employees in selected occupations	. Limited occupational coverage . Limited geographic and industry detail . Absence of entry-level wage data
	(ii) Hours and earnings data from the BLS-SESA Current Employment Statistics Program (CES)	States and major metropolitan areas	Monthly and annual averages	Provides data on average weekly hours of work and average weekly earnings for production or nonsupervisory wage and salary employees by one-digit or two-digit SIC's for states and metropolitan areas	. Limited geographic and industrial detail . Lacks occupational detail

Table 4-2: (Continued)

Types of Data or Information	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Shortcomings of Data
	(iii) Wage rates of job openings appearing on the Job Service job banks	States and major local labor areas	Monthly and cumulative annual data	Provides data on hourly wage rates of job openings listed on local job banks, by major occupational and industry group; wage data for selected detailed occupations	. Limited coverage of job openings appearing on job banks may bias wage data in downward direction . Limited availability of published wage data for jobs in an occupation requiring no previous experience
Information on the Structure of Internal Labor Markets of Local Firms	Such studies available only on an ad hoc basis (see text)	—	—	—	—
Information on Hiring Policies and Hiring Patterns of Local Firms	Such studies available only on ad hoc basis (see text)	—	—	—	—

The wage and salary employment data currently produced by the BLS-790 establishment survey are characterized by several major shortcomings from a local CETA program planning perspective. First, the establishment survey does not currently provide monthly wage and salary employment estimates for all SMSA's throughout the nation.[76] Second, the degree of industry detail available for SMSA's varies from one SMSA to another (depending on their size and industrial structure) and is frequently quite limited, typically providing employment estimates at only the 1-digit SIC level outside of manufacturing. Third, the monthly employment estimates are subject to revision (sometimes quite large) when new employment benchmarks based upon the ES-202 covered employment data base become available.[77] Finally, the monthly nonagricultural wage and salary employment estimates for many states and substate areas are frequently not seasonally adjusted.[78] As a result the monthly wage and salary data for states and major labor areas during a year cannot be used to determine secular employment trends.

The ES-202 survey of employment in establishments covered by the Federal and state U.I. laws is conducted on a quarterly basis by the State Employment Security Agencies.[79] This employer-based reporting system collects data on the number of employees on the payrolls of covered establishments for each month during the quarter.[80] The employment data representing a universe count of employment in covered establishments are typically published on an annual basis for 2-digit and 3-digit industries on a state and labor area basis and for major industry groups on a city and town basis.[81] Quarterly employment data from the survey are often available for the state and labor areas in unpublished form. In addition, the existence of city and town geographic identifiers on the ES-202 computer tapes for establishments allow industry employment data to be produced for prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas within each state.[82] The increased employment coverage of the state U.I. systems throughout the decade of the 1970's made available an extraordinarily comprehensive industry employment base that is capable of meeting many of the planning needs not only of CETA prime sponsors, but also those of other agencies involved in the delivery of employment-related educational and training services.[83]

The utility of the current ES-202 employment data base for CETA is hampered by a number of different factors. First, some multi-establishment firms continue to report their employment data from one central location and fail to provide separate breakouts of employment in each establishment within the state. As a result, employment for these particular multi-establishment firms will be inappropriately assigned to one geographic location rather than allocated to each of the specific geographic areas in which the individual establishments are physically located. Second, the SESA's will at times change the SIC classifications of particular establishments due to either changes in the national SIC coding system or a review of the major products and services produced by the establishment. If these changes are not worked back through the data system over the past few years, breaks will occur in the historical continuity of the data series and limit its usefulness for identifying growth industries within the state and local labor areas.[84] Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the SESA's tend to vary in their policies regarding the release of ES-202 employment data to users, such as CETA prime sponsors. Confidentiality issues have sometimes been raised by SESA's as a defense for their unwillingness to provide detailed ES-202 industry employment data (3-digit SIC) for local labor areas. The usefulness of the ES-202 data for planning employment and training programs is critically dependent upon its being made available to users in a timely and highly disaggregated fashion.[85] This area is one that is deserving of careful consideration by the NOICC and SOICC networks in the immediate future. The authors' recommendations with respect to the availability and use of ES-202 data will be provided in the concluding chapter of this report.

In addition to the data on local industry employment structure and trends, CETA prime sponsors also require information on the specific establishments comprising each industry to assist in both the development of OJT training slots for CETA-eligible individuals and the job placement of graduates from other local CETA employment and training programs. The importance of such specific employer information in determining the success of employment and training programs has been noted recently by Vernon Briggs:

> Where job placement was a key objective to a particular manpower program, general labor market data proved to be of little practical importance; programs need specific information pertinent to the specific labor market in which they operate. Aggregate demand information is of little use; project staff must know which firms are planning to expand and what occupations are involved. 85

A wide variety of employer directories have been produced by state economic development agencies and local Chambers of Commerce over the years. The bulk of these directores, however, suffer from a number of shortcomings that sharply limit their usefulness for CETA job development and job placement purposes. Among their more serious shortcomings are the limited degree of industrial coverage (often restricted to the manufacturing sector), the incomplete coverage of establishments within industrial sectors, and their frequent one-time nature.

The most comprehensive source of information on economic establishments at the state and local level is that provided by the ES-202 system.[87] The ES-202 file system within a state can be used to generate listings of establishments within 3-digit SIC industries of the state and its local labor areas. The production and publication of volumes containing information on the names, addresses, and employment size classes of establishment in each such industry would be particularly useful to CETA prime sponsors as well as public vocational education agencies and the SESA's in their job development and job placement activities. A series of efforts to produce such employer directories together with accompanying volumes containing information on the occupational staffing patterns of industries throughout the state have been recently carried out in the state of Massachusetts.[87b] Such job development-oriented information may well prove to be capable of substantively enhancing the job placement performance of CETA and other job training programs throughout the nation.

Existing Sources of Data on Occupational Staffing Patterns by Industry

Currently, there exist two major statistical programs that produce data on the occupational composition of industry employment. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has developed an Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) survey program that produces data on employment by occupation by industry through a cooperative Federal/state framework for most nonagricultural industries over a three-year cycle.[88] Additionally, occupational employment data derived from the Bureau of the Census' 5 percent and 15 percent samples for the 1970 decennial census have been used to produce data on occupational staffing patterns within industries for the nation, states, and major metropolitan areas.[89]

Census-Based Staffing Patterns Data

The 1970 decennial census collected data from two samples of households in the United States. The questionnaires for these two samples were designed to develop a wide variety of demographic and socio-economic information on the U.S. population.[90] One of the samples included 5 percent of the households in the nation and the other 15 percent of the households.[91] Both of the questionnaires used in collecting data from households in these samples were designed to capture information on the industry and occupational affiliation of employed persons in the sample households. The data files for these two samples were then merged to produce a 20 percent national sample of households.[92] This combined data file is capable of generating estimates of employment by detailed industry and occupation on a national basis, for all states, and for a substantial number of standard metropolitan statistical areas. Industry/occupation data derived from the Census are provided to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), who then develops distributions of industry-occupational employment through national and state industry/occupation matrix systems.[93]

The occupational staffing patterns data derived from the decennial Census have been criticized for three primary reasons:

i) A belief that substantial response and coding errors exist with respect to the occupational data derived from the Census;[94]

ii) Since the census data are produced (until now) only once every ten years, they become outdated and, therefore, may be somewhat misleading over time;

iii) The level of occupational detail available from the census-based staffing pattern data is inadequate to meet the needs of a substantial number of data users. The Bureau of the Census has utilized an occupational classification scheme that only includes approximately 440 occupational groups.[95] In addition, the classification system is based on socio-economic characteristics of people in an occupation rather than the specific set of skills required to work in an occupation.[96]

The shortcomings of the Census-based occupational data outlined above may limit the data's usefulness for CETA program planning purposes as well as for vocational education planning. Partly as a result of these perceived limitations, the BLS initiated the Occupational Employment Statistics survey program in 1971. This occupational employment survey was designed to overcome a number of the deficiencies believed to exist within the Census data.

OES Survey-Based Data

Former BLS Assistant Commissioner Harold Goldstein stated at the inception of the OES survey that it was primarily designed to "...measure the growth of occupations and the changing occupational structure of the labor force, both in the United States and in states and local areas."[97] The OES survey is designed as a cooperative Federal-state statistical program, with BLS providing technical support and survey questionnaires to state employment security agencies. The SESA's are responsible for collecting the data from responding business establishments, tabulating the data, and publishing estimates of detailed occupational employment by industry.[98]

Using an occupational classification system composed of about 2,200 job titles and definitions, the BLS had developed lists of occupations that were specific to a two-digit SIC industry.[99] Recently, this list of occupations has been reduced by BLS to 1,600 titles. These listings are used to develop the basic questionnaires employed in the OES survey. Each questionnaire includes between 50 and 200 different job titles and definitions that have been judged by BLS to be germane to a specific industry. The survey itself is conducted over a three-year cycle, with approximately one-third of the nonagricultural economy within the scope of the survey in a given year. Survey questionnaires are mailed by cooperating SESA's to business establishments throughout the state. Completed forms are returned to the SESA's who then tabulate the data and publish estimates of staffing patterns. By the end of 1979, three full survey rounds have been completed, and the number of cooperating SESA's has increased from 15 in 1971 to 48 in 1980.

The outputs of the OES program include publications of industry employment by selected detailed occupation within industry, industry/occupational coefficients for selected occupations, and estimates of the relative error associated with each occupational employment estimate. Additionally, some states currently have available industry/occupation matrices based upon data produced by the OES survey. These matrices are capable of yielding cross-industry employment estimates by occupation and can also be used to develop current (nonsurvey year) estimates of employment by occupation and industry. Staffing pattern data based upon the OES survey are also expected to supplant the Census-based data in the state and area occupational projections program of BLS. At this time, dissemination of these data by BLS and cooperating SESA's has not been widespread.[100]

Major Limitations of the OES Survey

In contrast to the household-based occupational staffing pattern data derived from the decennial census, data derived from the OES survey are based upon employer reports of employment by occupation. Given this situation, the likelihood of either response bias resulting from occupational "overstatement" or of clerical coding errors should be substantially mitigated. In addition, since the nonagricultural economy is completely surveyed once every three years, data derived from OES are substantially more timely than census-based data.[101] Finally, the level of occupational detail available from OES surveys is substantially greater than that produced under the Census-based system.

The OES survey, however, also suffers from a number of limitations, particularly from a CETA program planning perspective. A basic input into the development of a comprehensive analysis of local labor markets is information on the rate and level of growth of industry and occupational employment and on changes in the structure of occupational employment by industry. In order to conduct such an analysis, however, the occupational staffing pattern data for local industries must be comparable over time. Unfortunately, the lists of occupational titles and definitions employed in the OES survey have undergone substantial and continuous revision since the inception of the program. In part, this has occurred because the OES occupational classification system was initially viewed as an ad hoc system to be eventually replaced by a standard occupational classification system.[102] Delays in developing and responding in the standard occupational system have precluded its use in the OES survey system.

A second major limitation of OES survey data for CETA prime sponsor planning purposes is its lack of availability at the sub-state level.[103] Chapter 3 of this report included a discussion of the desirability of obtaining industry staffing pattern estimates for states and major labor areas. The OES sample sizes, however, have precluded the estimation of industry staffing pattern data at such a sub-state level. As part of its research efforts, however, the BLS has developed a number of techniques for estimating sub-state staffing patterns without increasing the overall OES sample size.[104] NOICC has recently provided funding to the Colorado SOICC to test these alternative methodologies to determine the overall level of accuracy that can be produced under each method.

The final and perhaps the most serious limitation of the OES survey program is the frequent lack of general availability of the data to CETA planning staff. This limitation apparently has occurred as a result of the following three major factors.

First, the BLS confidentiality criteria stipulate that data are to be suppressed if:

1) There are fewer than three firms (companies, not establishments) reporting data for an occupation within an industry to be published;

2) There are three or more firms in the response but one firm reported more than 50 percent of the occupational estimate;

3) Two firms combined reported 75 percent of the occupational estimate. [105]

Given the level of industrial and occupational detail required by CETA program planners, the potential for a substantial amount of data suppression exists, particularly if sub-state estimates are desired.

Second, the OES survey publication criteria also limit the amount of staffing pattern data that can be made available to CETA planners. The level of detail published by a state is in large part determined by BLS regional offices since no national office publication criteria currently exists. The BLS New England Regional Office generally adheres to the following publications' standards:

1. An occupational employment estimate for an industry cannot be published unless the overall industry response rate is 70 percent or greater and the relative error associated with the occupational estimate for that industry does not exceed 50 percent;
2. Industries with a response rate between 50 percent and 70 percent may have some occupations published provided that they have relative error rates no greater than 35 percent and that the state in question has done well in the survey validation process;
3. The BLS regional office has discouraged states from publishing estimates for industries that employ fewer than 1000 workers unless the response rate for that industry exceeds 80 percent and its staffing patterns appear homogeneous.[106]

Given the overall OES sample size and the rates of response produced under the OES survey, the program's confidentiality and publications criteria will substantially limit the amount of occupational detail available to prime sponsor staff, particularly at the sub-state level. It should be noted that some states have made unpublished data from the OES survey available to CETA prime sponsor planners for their use in developing annual plans. A number of recommendations to improve future dissemination of OES data will be provided in the concluding chapter of this report.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, few CETA planners appear to be aware of the existence of the OES survey and its publications within their states. Discussions held by the authors with a relatively large number of CETA planning staff in New England and across the nation reveal that few planners are aware of the existence of the survey program or of the data generated through the survey. In part, this lack of awareness may be attributable to several factors including:

1. The lack of a systematic effort on the part of BLS, ETA, and SESA's to promote the use of OES data within the CETA planning process;
2. The lack of a systematic method for disseminating data produced from the OES survey to CETA planning staff;
3. Constraints on the industry, occupational and geographic detail available from the OES survey due to the confidentiality, publications criteria, and sample size limitations discussed above.

In the view of the authors, the occupational staffing pattern data derived from the OES survey program should be the basic component of a state's Occupational Information System. A number of improvements in the OES survey data can be made to increase its future usefulness to CETA planning staff. These recommended changes will be presented in the concluding chapter of this report.

Sources or Data on Labor Turnover and Accessions

Two major sources of establishment-based data currently exist that provide estimates of labor turnover and accessions by industry. The Bureau of Labor Statistics cooperative Federal-state Labor Turnover Survey (LTS) is primarily designed to produce estimates of total accessions, new hires, recalls, and other accessions as well as total separations, quits, lay-offs, fires, and other separations in the mining, manufacturing, and telecommunications industries.[107] The second source of labor turnover data is available from the Employment and Training Administration-funded Employment Service Potential (ESP) project.[108] ESP is an experimental data collection effort operated by selected

SESA's throughout the nation and is designed to produce aggregated data on accessions and separations by detailed industry within states and selected substate areas. In addition, several of the states cooperating in the ESP endeavor have made efforts to analyze the actual degree of penetration by industry of ES placement efforts by comparing estimates of new hires by industry with SESA job placements.[109]

The BLS Labor Turnover Survey

The Bureau of Labor Statistics in cooperation with the research and statistics divisions of the SESA's in 47 states and the District of Columbia prepare monthly estimates of total separations, quits, lay-offs, fires, and other separations as well as total accessions, new hires, recalls, and other accessions for selected detailed industries of the nation, states, and large metropolitan areas.[110] Similar to the procedures for operating other Federal/state cooperative statistical programs, BLS provides the SESA's with technical support and survey questionnaires. The SESA's themselves collect the data directly from a panel of some 44,000 business establishments across the nation on a monthly basis. The SESA's also publish tabulations of labor turnover typically by selected 2-digit industries for states and metropolitan areas. The BLS also produces national estimates of accessions and separations on a monthly basis. The LTS program is among the oldest of the statistical programs operated by BLS, dating back to 1926. Its primary use up to now has been that of an economic indicator for national policymakers as well as a tool for personnel planning and anaysis by private sector employers.[111] The data derived from the LTS program may prove to be capable of meeting at least some of the information needs of CETA prime sponsor planners, particularly with respect to identifying local industries with high job placement potential and industrial workforce stability.

During the past several years, however, labor market analysts both inside and outside the Bureau of Labor Statistics have voiced increasing skepticism with respect to the accuracy of the turnover data derived from the LTS. Similar to other BLS establishment-based statistical programs (most notably the Current Employment Survey), the LTS lacks key properties of a well-designed statistical sample survey. The most notable deficiency is that cooperating establishments are selected to participate in the LTS survey in a nonrandom way. As a result of this nonrandomness and underrepresentation of small establishments, it is believed that substantial error in the turnover estimates may have developed

220

over the years to the extent that turnover data derived from the survey can be quite misleading.[112]

A second major limitation of the LTS data with respect to its use by CETA program planners is its limited industrial coverage. The LTS program currently only covers firms in the mining, manufacturing, and telecommunications industries. The need for measuring labor turnover in other industries is becoming increasingly important as the mining, manufacturing, and telecommunications industries have provided a declining share of total nonagricultural wage and salary employment in the nation over time.[113]

The BLS has recently initiated efforts aimed at resolving the above problems through it's pilot Job Openings Survey (JOS) currently being conducted in four states throughout the nation (Florida, Massachusetts, Texas, and Utah). A major component of the project is focused upon expanding the LTS survey into all nonagricultural industries on a probability basis. In addition, a probability sample of establishments in the manufacturing sector was drawn to provide a basis for measuring the extent to which biases may exist within the on-going LTS effort.[114] Unfortunately, at this time, few empirical findings are available from this effort.[115]

A third major limitation of the LTS program is the complete absence of data on the occupational characteristics of labor turnover. Given this situation, it is not currently possible to identify either high or low turnover occupations from the survey for use in planning CETA or vocational education programs.

In addition, some analysts believe that the expansion of the LTS sample size necessary for producing occupational estimates would substantially increase program costs and might actually contribute to existing biases.[116]

The Employment Service Potential Project

Over the past several years, the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor has funded a number of SESA's to test the feasibility of estimating total new hire rates and separation rates as well as occupational new hires from existing administrative records. By analyzing over time the individual worker data contained in the Unemployment Insurance tax reports submitted by covered establishments, the Employment Service Potential (ESP) project is designed to provide estimates of accessions, new hires, recalls from lay-offs, and total separations by industry in a state on a quarterly basis.[117] U.I. tax reports can be submitted by covered employers to state U.I. agencies in two different ways. In a minority of states (11), firms report only aggregate employment and wages data as well as their appropriate tax bill.[118] In the remainder of the states, however, covered employers provide a listing of the individual employees on their payrolls during the quarter and their social security numbers. In these states, social security numbers of employees can be tracked from quarter to quarter on a firm, industry, and area basis. As a result, detailed data on accessions and separations can be produced by industry. Additionally, estimates of total new hires and recalls from layoff can also be generated by this system.

Turnover data generated on the basis of the U.I. system's administrative records have also been used to identify the occupational composition of new hires in states. For example, in the state of Utah, the SESA research agency designed a questionnaire to solicit information on the occupational characteristics of workers identified on the U.I. tax reports of employers. Data derived from this effort were used to produce estimates of occupational new hire rates in that state.[119] In California, follow-up interviews were conducted with a sample of employers after they had submitted their U.I. tax reports.[120] These interviews were designed to capture information on differences in turnover rates among workers in selected occupational groups and to develop an understanding of the factors that influenced turnover in an occupation.

The data derived from the ESP project, while potentially useful for CETA program planning purposes, currently appear to suffer from a number of shortcomings, including the following:

1. Turnover data produced under the ESP project may be subject to substantial error. Although social security numbers are composed of nine digits, ESP screening permits a seven digit social security number match to be counted as no change in employment status. As such, it is not clear to what extent ESP data are truly reflective of actual labor turnover experiences of firms;
2. The level of detail available on labor turnover from ESP is currently limited. ESP is not capable of identifying the source of separations (quits, fires, layoffs) unless a supplemental survey is conducted. In addition, ESP concepts of new hires and recalls

from layoffs differ in several substantive ways from those employed in the Labor Turnover Survey program;

3. ESP by itself is not capable of yielding occupational details on labor turnover. Supplementary surveys must be used to produce occupational data from ESP. Such supplementary surveys, however, can provide substantial insights into the occupational characteristics of turnover as well as the sources of turnover in an occupation.

The primary goal of the ESP program is to provide information on firms' hiring activities so that the overall job placement performance of SESA's can be improved. For CETA program planning purposes, however, ESP appears to be somewhat limited since it is not currently capable of providing information on the occupational characteristics of labor turnover or the sources of turnover. The BLS Labor Turnover Survey, while providing detailed data on the sources of turnover, also provides no information on the occupational characteristics of labor turnover.[121]

During FY 1980, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as part of its JOS Pilot project, is experimenting with the direct collection of data on new hires by occupation and industry in four states. The survey is designed to produce estimates of the numbers of monthly new hires on a quarterly basis for a group of about 120 SOC-based occupations. In addition, a data quality check employing a diary approach has been developed to assess the accuracy of the reported new hires data. If these new hires data by occupation prove to be reliable, they may be used in conjunction with OES-based occupational employment data to estimate new hire rates by occupation in states.

Sources of Data on the Numbers and Occupational Characteristics of Job Openings

Job vacancy data have frequently been viewed as a key basic input into the CETA program planning process as well as a critical source of information for determining the efficiency of the operation of state and local labor markets and understanding the nature and causes of unemployment.[122] Despite the potential usefulness of job vacancy data, little systematic data exists on the total number or the industrial and occupational composition of current job openings. Planners of employment and training programs have, thus, been forced to rely upon newspaper help-wanted advertising and job openings appearing on SESA job banks for obtaining estimates of job vacancies for use in their annual planning documents.

Data derived from help-wanted advertising are generally quite limited with respect to the quantity and quality of information that they provide. Studies of help-wanted advertising have revealed that systematic information on the aggregate level of job openings or the industrial, occupational, and wage characteristics of vacant jobs cannot be derived from newspaper help-wanted listings.[123] At best, data derived from help-wanted advertising may be capable of serving as a basis for producing an index of labor demand over time. Help-wanted indices, such as that produced by the Conference Board, are of almost no value to those individuals charged with the responsibility of designing and implementing local employment and training programs.[124] The needs of training program planners are more closely related to the availability of information on the level of employment and current job openings by industry and occupation, together with additional information on their locations and associate wage rates. Some such data do currently exist in the form of a series of tabulations of unfilled job openings listed by employers on SESA Job Banks.[125] Job Bank-published tabulations typically provide information on the number of job orders listed with the Job Banks by employers that remain unfilled on the last day of the month.

The SESA Job Bank job openings data are also generally classified by occupation (DOT codes), geographic area of the state, and their wage rates. Some states also provide more detailed information on educational and training requirements for occupations and reasons for their being difficult to fill.[126] Additionally, SESA Job Banks also contain information on the industrial affiliations of employers, their names and addresses, and the name of a contact person within the firm.[127] SESA Job Bank data can, thus, serve as a very useful tool for job development and placement purposes, however, they do suffer from several deficiencies that limit their use as an analytical tool in the CETA planning process.

A first major limitation of the Job Bank job openings data is that the job orders placed by employers with the Job Service represent only some (typically unknown) fraction of the total number of job openings that exist in a state or local area at any given point in time. This fraction is determined in large part by the extent to which employers volunteer or are mandated to list their available job openings with the SESA.[128] A second major potential problem with job bank data is that the proportion of job vacancies covered by the Job Banks will likely vary sharply by occupation since employers tend to use different sources, such as newspaper ads, private employment agencies, or informal referrals, for different types of jobs.[129] Consequently, the occupational distribution of job openings listed by employers on job bank is likely to differ substantially from the actual overall occupational distribution of job openings.[130] The wider the differences between the Job Bank and actual occupational distributions of job openings, the less useful are Job Bank data for identifying imbalances in state and local labor markets. During the 1969-73 period, the Federal/state cooperative Job Openings Labor Survey (JOLTS) produced estimates on total job openings for the nation, states, and selected major metropolitan areas.[131] This statistical survey program was cancelled in 1973 by the late BLS Commissioner Julius Shiskin, who stated that,

> ...the data cannot be used for direct placement. In addition, the current program does not appear to meet the needs of economic analysts because the data cannot be matched with the components of the employment and unemployment survey. 132

Since the cancellation of the JOLTS program, however, new interest has developed at the national level with respect to the production of job openings data by occupation.[133] Beginning in March of 1979, the BLS in cooperation with the SESA's of Florida, Massachusetts, Texas, and Utah has begun an experimental job openings data collection effort. The pilot Job Openings Survey (JOS) project was designed to produce estimates of total current job openings, job openings remaining vacant over 30 days, job openings with future starting dates, and job openings for part-time positions by rather detailed occupation and industry.

Relying upon a random stratified sample of 1,200 nonagricultural business establishments in each state, the pilot survey was designed to test the feasibility of collecting data on job openings by occupation and to assess the accuracy of reported data. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the pilot project also attempted to expand the Labor Turnover Survey into the nonmanufacturing sector and to produce probability estimates of labor turnover in manufacturing. Finally, in one of the cooperating states, efforts were undertaken to collect new hires data by occupation.[134]

The JOS survey has been conducted on a quarterly basis since March of 1979 and was scheduled to continue through June of 1980. At the time of this writing, one year has passed since the reference data of the survey's first data collection round; however, no estimates of job openings for any of the four participating states have yet been produced by the BLS. In addition, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has not yet prepared any studies related to the quality of the data being produced by the pilot survey. In addition, the pilot vacancy projects are scheduled for refunding during FY 1981. Although the BLS has not produced any formal papers related to the feasibility of collecting job openings data, the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development has undertaken an extensive research effort focused upon job openings data quality and data collection issues.[135] Findings of these research studies have revealed that data comparable in quality to other major BLS statistical series can seemingly be produced by a job openings survey.[136]

In the view of the authors, a job vacancy survey similar in design to the pilot JOS project that is capable of producing job openings data for states and major local labor areas would be extraordinarily useful for CETA planning purposes, both locally and nationally. More detailed recommendations concerning a vacancy survey of this type are included in the final chapter of this report.

Sources of Data on Projections of Employment by Industry and Occupation at the State and Substate Level

Chapter 3 of this report contained a discussion of the desirability and potential uses of data on projections of employment by industry and occupation and estimates of annual job openings by occupation for use in the CETA planning process.[137] The discussion described the needs of CETA prime sponsor planners for data not only on long term (4-6 years) comprehensive projections of employment by industry and occupation, but also for relatively short-run (1-2 year) projections of employment in selected industry occupational job clusters at the state and major labor area level. A number of econometric models currently exist that are capable of producing short-term industry employment projections for states.[138] Models capable of producing sub-state industry employment projections, however, have not as yet been developed.[139] Additionally, at this time existing econometric-based employment forecasting models have not been adapted to produce estimates of short-term job prospects for selected industry-occupation job clusters.[140] In summary, there appear to be no short-term employment projections data currently in existence that can be considered as useful for CETA program planning purposes.[141]

A rather substantial body of data does exist, however, with respect to long-term projections of employment by industry and of employment and job openings by occupation. The BLS in cooperation with State Employment Security Agencies conducts as part of its overall Occupational Employment Statistics program the state and area projections program. The state and area projections program is designed to "provide a measurement of the magnitude of change in occupational employment requirements over the projection period" for states and major labor market areas on a periodic basis.[142]

Using regression analysis techniques, SESA staff make projections of wage and salary employment by detailed industry for the state and selected major labor areas.[143] These wage and salary employment projections by industry are then adjusted by excluding secondary jobs of multiple job holders and by including estimates of the number of self-employed individuals, unpaid family workers, and workers with a job on unpaid leave. These adjustments are made by applying national proportions to the state employment projections.[144] These procedures yield the projections of total employment by industry for the state or local labor area. These industry employment estimates are then reviewed by SESA staff for "reasonableness" and adjusted by them whenever appropriate.[145] Projections of occupational employment are prepared by applying one of two types of industry/occupational (I-O) matrices to the industry projections. The data inputs into those matrices were described in the staffing pattern section of this chapter. The first type of I-O matrix is largely based upon occupational data derived from the decennial census. It is composed of data for approximately 377 census occupations cross-classified by 201 industries. The coefficients are updated to the base year of the projection (to account for changes in industry staffing patterns) and projected to the target year (1985) by applying national change factors.[146] As a result of the shortcomings of the census-based matrix data for employment projections purposes, BLS has, over the past several years, engaged in efforts to produce I-O matrices that are based upon staffing pattern estimates derived primarily from the OES survey program. Although they are not available in all states, these matrices are substantially more detailed and provide data on approximately 1,700 occupations. Unlike the projections based upon Census I-O matrices, occupational employment projections that use the OES survey-based matrices assume static staffing patterns. In addition, existing OES survey-based matrices are hybrid in nature; i.e., some of the staffing pattern data are classified by 1967 SIC industry codes and others by 1972 SIC industry codes.

After the appropriate I-O matrix is applied to the industry employment projections for the target year to generate occupational employment projections for that year, estimates of replacement demand for each occupation are produced. Currently, estimates of replacement demand are based upon separation rates for occupations that are generated by applying national separation rates by age and sex to the age-sex distribution of employment by occupation in the state.[147] These procedures produce estimates of labor force separations due to death, disability, retirement, and family responsibilities.[148] These replacement demand estimates do not take account of replacement due to occupational or geographic mobility.[149] Estimates of labor force separation rates for age-sex groups are revised from time to time by BLS for inclusion in the projections program.[150] The separation rates for occupations are then applied to the occupational employment projections to yield estimates of annual average job openings by occupation during the period between the base and target year of the projections period.[151]

Limitations of the State and Area Projections Program

Currently, the data outputs of the State and Area Projections program suffer from a number of limitations for use by CETA program planning staff. Among the major limitations of the program is the lack of up-to-date employment projections, particularly for sub-state areas. All of the industry-occupational employment data in the Census-based matrix are coded on a 1967 SIC basis, and major components of the OES survey-based matrix are also coded on a 1967 SIC industry basis. The industry employment data that are used to make the projections, however, are currently coded on a 1972 SIC basis. As a result, the two data series are not comparable.[152] In order to make the data comparable, SESA analysts must covert current industry employment data back to their 1967 SIC classification. Due to the considerable time and resources that must be devoted to this conversion process, some SESA agencies have been reluctant to undertake the task of SIC code conversion at the sub-state level. Consequently, up-to-date projections that reflect more recent economic developments in sub-state areas may be available only on a statewide basis in many states. A second problem with the projections data centers upon the lack of current estimates of labor force separation rates. Job openings resulting from labor force separations account for nearly two-thirds of all projected annual job openings in the U.S. between 1976 and 1985.[153] Given the relative importance of the job openings due to replacement in determining overall job openings it is critical that the separation rate estimates be up-dated frequently by BLS and incorporated into the state and local projections. Frequent updates are needed to guarantee that the separations rates not become outdated.[154] Failure to update changes in separation rates will lead to errors in estimates of projected job openings due to replacement demand.[155]

A third limitation of the data produced by the State and Area projections program is the current lack of knowledge regarding the degree of accuracy of the industry and occupational employment projections. While several studies have been conducted of the accuracy of the national BLS industry employment projections, very little systematic analysis of the accuracy of the state and area employment projections has been undertaken.[156] This area is one in which the NOICC and SOICC organizations should become more actively involved.[157] Increased acceptability and use of the projections data by CETA prime sponsors and vocational education agencies is likely to become dependent upon careful assessments of the accuracy of the projections.

A final potentially major limitation of the use of the data derived from the State and Area Projections program from a CETA and vocational education planning perspective focuses upon the extent to which estimated annual average job openings for occupations are available to workers from outside the firm. Job openings in higher level occupations within firms may be filled in large part through internal promotions rather than external hires, particular of inexperienced workers. To the degree that this occurs, the projected estimates of annual job openings within such occupations will overstate the number of openings available to workers outside the firm, particularly graduates of CETA-related employment and training programs. In turn, the projections will produce an understatement of actual job openings in selected entry level occupations. This will occur due to the fact that employers must now fill the positions vacated by workers who were promoted to higher level occupations. At this point in time and in the foreseeable future the State and Area Projections program will not be capable of discerning between those job openings that will be filled from the external labor market and those job openings that will primarily if not totally be filled by current employees of the firm. Knowledge of the actual internal labor market situation for specific occupations will have to be produced through local employer-based surveys of hiring practices and policies.

Sources of Data on Wages and Hours of Work by Occupation

In addition to the data on the current and projected levels of employment by occupation in local labor markets, CETA prime sponsor policymakers and program planners are also in need of timely and accurate data on the hourly wages and hours of work by occupation. The wage and hours data can be used to identify the earnings potential of various occupations and, thus, their ability to increase the earned incomes of CETA participants, a basic national goal of CETA employment and training programs.

Comprehensive and systematic data on the starting hourly wage rates, average hourly or weekly wages, maximum weekly wages, and average weekly hours of work by occupation are, however, generally not available to local prime sponsor planning staff. The BLS through its Occupational Pay and Supplementary Benefits program does provide some occupational wage data.[159] These data, however, are of somewhat limited value to CETA prime sponsor planning staff. The BLS Industry Wage Surveys provide national and regional wage data for selected industries and occupations as well as information on work schedules and fringe benefits.[160] In addition these data are occasionally available for selected metropolitan areas. The Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay provides data on salary levels for selected white collar occupations on a national basis.[161] The Municipal Government Wage Survey provides data on wages of public sector employees in 50 occupations for selected cities.[162] Finally, the Area Wage Surveys of th BLS provide wage and salary data for 76 occupational groups in some 70 metropolitan areas on an annual basis.[163]

As a result of the specific and limited purposes of the surveys, the BLS Wage Surveys are not comprehensive in either their industrial or occupational coverage. In addition, they are frequently limited with respect to their geographic coverage. Consequently, the wage and fringe benefits data produced by the major BLS wage surveys are of limited usefulness to CETA planning staff although selected estimates for particular occupations in specific SMSA's may be useful to a particular prime sponsor interested in providing training for such occupations; e.g., secretarial.

The BLS Current Employment Statistics program (CES) produces data on employment, hours, and earnings of workers in detailed industries nationally, with more aggregate estimates produced for states and major local labor areas on a monthly basis.[164] The data on hourly and weekly earnings and average weekly hours of work, however, are not occupation-specific. They refer only to average earnings and hours of all production workers in manufacturing and nonsupervisory workers in nonmanufacturing sectors. Nonetheless, the hours and earnings data derived from the CES program can provide some useful general insights into the earnings potential that exists for workers within those sectors for which detailed industry earnings and hours data are available at the state and local level.[165]

The most current comprehensive source of information on hourly and/or weekly wage rates by occupation is available through the SESA Job Bank program that was described above. In addition to providing information on the occupational and industrial characteristics of job openings listed by employers, Job Bank data also provide information on the associated wage rates of job openings.[166] While the occupational wage data from the Job Bank are subject to the same limitations as overall job openings data appearing on the Job Bank, (e.g., representativeness of the job orders listed with the SESA's) such wage data are capable of providing certain insights into starting wage rates for jobs by industry and occupation that are useful for CETA program planning purposes.

The final source of occupational wage data available to CETA planning staff is produced through special wage surveys conducted by SESA's or local business groups, including Chambers of Commerce. OES survey data have been utilized by a number of SESA's as basis for the design of such wage survey's.[167] The characteristics of these surveys vary widely from state to state; however, they are generally designed to produce estimates of starting hourly wage rates and average wage rates for workers in selected occupations within selected industries. Such surveys are frequently conducted on an ad hoc basis. As a result, the methodologies, concepts, and timing of these surveys tend to vary sharply from one another. The continued development of the OES survey data base within states does provide an opportunity for the implementation of more comprehensive and representative occupational wage surveys in the future. Findings of the OES surveys could be used to target such wage survey efforts at specific growth industry-occupational clusters being considered for the provision of training.

Sources of Information on the Structure of Internal Labor Markets of Local Firms

It has earlier been argued that data on the current occupational staffing patterns of local industries and projections of future job openings by occupation should be supplemented by information on the internal labor market structures of local industries and firms.[168] Such information would ideally identify the number and occupational characteristics of ports of entry into firms and their linkages with other jobs in those firms through internal career ladders.[169] Knowledge of the nature of these ports of entry is critical to the planning of job training programs by CETA and vocational education agencies since it is only these jobs that will be available to the graduates of these programs.

Despite the importance of information on internal labor markets and ports of entry, little information is currently available to CETA prime sponsor planners with respect to the nature and operations of local firms' internal labor markets. Currently, no systematic statistical data collection program aimed at capturing such information is being conducted by Federal or state agencies.[170] In part, this lack of information can be attributed to the fact that:

> Internal labor market analysis suggests considerable flexibility in the process whereby employers adjust workers and jobs. However, much of this information is specific to each enterprise even though it might be useful to other employers and to public policymakers. 171

As a result of the frequently unique nature of firms' internal labor market structures, it can be quite difficult and expensive to mount a data collection effort designed to produce aggregate data on the structure of internal labor markets at the local level. This drawback does not, however, obviate the need for such information for planning local job training programs. As the author of the above quotation, Secretary of Labor Ray Marshall, went on to state:

> ...The need exists for a mechanism to collect information on the operation of internal labor markets, analyze this information, and disseminate it to labor market participants who can profit from it.[172]

In spite of the technical and methodological problems involved in producing such information, a number of efforts have been undertaken primarily by researchers within the academic community, toward gaining insight into the operations of particular firms' internal labor markets. Foremost among these efforts has been the work of Doeringer and Piore, who conducted studies of internal labor markets within manufacturing firms in the late 1960's.[173] The primary purpose of their study was to develop a set of generalizations about the nature of the structure and workings of firms' internal labor markets to provide a general guide to manpower policymakers. They accomplished this task by conducting a series of case studies of the internal labor markets of individual firms and then by generalizing upon the findings of such studies. While this particular approach was appropriate given the purposes of their study, such generalizations are not likely to produce the more specific information on local internal labor markets that would be most useful to CETA planning staff.

The CETA planning process, when properly conducted, requires relatively disaggregated information on the ports of entry and internal career ladders of local firms.[174] In order to achieve this objective, a profile of the internal labor markets of selected local business establishments needs to be developed. Such a profile would include an inventory of entry-level jobs in the local economy and career promotion ladders for various entry-level jobs. This inventory would provide information on the potential for and nature of promotion opportunities for selected occupations within various local industries.

As noted in Chapter 3, the bulk of the information produced by such studies would be qualitative in nature. The inventory would be designed to not only provide guidance to CETA and vocational education agencies in the planning of job training programs, but also to assist in the career counseling of students at the secondary and postsecondary level.

Sources of Information on Hiring Practices and Policies of Local Firms

Chapter 3 of this report provided a discussion of the critical role of information on hiring practices and policies of local firms for CETA program planning purposes. The usefulness of such information in properly planning and designing skills training programs has frequently been noted by other analysts:

> ...planners need information on employer hiring preferences and practices, as well as on the existence of rigid institutional constraints and other barriers to entry into many occupations.[175]

> The planning of training programs requires data on the current state of labor market demand and also on the required characteristics of the labor supply. Prospective workers also need information particularly where acquiring training is dependent on acquiring a job. Especially in these cases, they need information not only about job openings, but also about the screening criteria and the training practices of local companies. 176

Similar to the development of information on the internal labor markets of local firms, the information on firms' hiring policies and practices for CETA program and planning purposes would be qualitative as well as quantitative in nature. This information would include formal educational and training requirements, experience requirements, license, bonding requirements, etc. To date, efforts to generate information of this sort have largely been conducted on an ad hoc basis primarily by academic researchers although the findings of such efforts would likely prove quite useful for planning training programs in a variety of occupational areas.[177] CETA prime sponsor staff have also typically engaged in limited information gathering with respect to local firms' hiring policies and practices. Most such prime sponsor efforts were quite nonsystematic and were frequently only a small part of CETA marketing efforts.[178] Further, until recently, there has been an absence of mechanisms for CETA prime sponsors to share information on employer hiring practices and policies with one another.

In recent months, influenced by the passage of the Title VII PSIP legislation, a variety of efforts have been undertaken to produce information on local firms' hiring policies and practices for use in planning and designing Title II B and VII training programs.[179] These efforts, however, typically continue to be undertaken on an ad hoc basis and have been designed to serve a relatively wide variety of information needs at the prime sponsor level.

23

Guidance for CETA prime sponsor planners with respect to the use, design, and implementation of local surveys of employer hiring practices and policies needs to be provided by the Labor Market Information Division of ETA, NOICC, and the SOICC network. The recommendations of the authors with respect to the role, design, and use of employer-based surveys in overall CETA program planning will be provided in the concluding chapter of this study.

Sources of Occupational Supply Data for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning

An overview of available data sources on occupational supply within states and substate areas is presented in Tables 4-3A and 4-3B. Table 4-3A lists and describes available data sources on the occupational characteristics of unemployed job seekers in states and local labor areas. Table 4-3B provides a listing of available data and information sources on various non-CETA related classroom training and apprenticeship programs.[180] The classroom training programs include those administered by both public and private institutions at the secondary and postsecondary levels.

Occupational Characteristics of Unemployed Job Seekers

One major type of occupational supply data useful for planning local CETA programs, particularly occupationally-oriented skills training programs, is that of data on the occupational characteristics of unemployed jobseekers in local labor areas. There are three major sources of current data on the occupational characteristics of the unemployed in state and local labor areas. These sources are the Current Population Survey of households, the ES-203 survey of the characteristics of the insured unemployed under regular state U.I. programs, and the Employment Service Automated Reporting System (ESARS) operated by the SESA's. The geographic coverage, frequency of publication, primary characteristics, and major limitations of each of these data sources are summarized in Table 4-3A.

Estimates of the occupational characteristics of all of the unemployed in states and selected substate areas are produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on the basis of data collected through the CPS household survey. The estimates have been produced recently on an annual basis for all states, the 30 largest SMSA's and 11 central cities in the Geographic Profiles of Employment and

Table 4-3A: Available Data Sources on the Occupational Characteristics of the Unemployed in State and Local Labor Areas and Prime Sponsor Planning Areas

Types of Data	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Occupational Characteristics of All of the Unemployed	Current Population Survey of Households	States, 30 largest SMSA's, all large central cities	Annual averages	Estimates of the number of unemployed and rates of unemployment for broad occupational groups of workers	. Available only on an annual basis . Limited geographic coverage . Limited occupational detail
Occupational Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed	ES-203 survey and SESA publications based on ES-203 survey data	States, selected labor areas within states	Varies; monthly, quarterly, and annual average data may be produced	Number of insured unemployed in occupational areas; occupational detail varies (1-digit, 3-digit DOT codes); Data on the durations of the current unemployment spells of the insured unemployed in various occupations may also be provided	. Insured unemployed typically account for a minority of all unemployed; . Variable geographic coverage within states . Limited occupational detail for substate areas . Concern with respect to accuracy of occupations coding of U.I. claimants

Table 4-3A: (continued)

Types of Data	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Occupational Characteristics of Active Applicants in SESA Placement Offices	ESARS System	States and selected major labor areas within states	Monthly reports typically produced	Number of active job applicants in various occupations (3-digit, 6-digit, 9-digit DOT codes); Selected demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of active applicants in various occupations	. Active applicants account for only a minority of all unemployed . Some active applicants are not unemployed . Lack of geographic detail in published tables for prime sponsor planning areas . Potential problems with purging of inactive applicants

Unemployment. Estimates are provided for the annual average number of unemployed persons and unemployment rates for workers in 9-10 broad Census occupational groups; e.g., professional and technical, managers and administrators.[182]

While the above unemployment data are potentially useful in that they pertain to all of the unemployed in an occupational category rather than to some subgroup of the unemployed, such as the insured unemployed or active applicants in SESA job placement offices, they are characterized by a number of major shortcomings from a local CETA prime sponsor planning perspective. First, the data are published only on an annual basis, and the state and substate data have often been produced with considerable time lags (nine or more months after the end of the calendar year to which they pertain).[183] Second, the occupational unemployment data are only provided for a limited number of substate areas; thus, most CETA prime sponsors would not have access to data directly related to the unemployment situation in their areas. Third, the occupational detail of the published unemployment data is quite limited, providing only general indicators of employment trends in broad occupational areas.[184] For program planning purposes, substantially more detailed occupational unemployment data are required.

Information on the occupational characteristics of the insured unemployed within states and selected substate areas is produced by the ES-203 program described earlier in this chapter. Data are frequently published by SESA's on the occupational characteristics of the insured unemployed classified by 1-digit and 3-digit DOT codes on a monthly, quarterly, and/or annual basis.[185] The frequency with which these reports are published by the SESA's does vary as does the level of geographic and occupational detail provided.[186] These reports may also contain information on the demographic characteristics of the insured unemployed in various occupational categories and the durations of their unemployment spells.

The greater geographic and occupational detail typically available from the ES-203 program have a number of potential advantages for their use in the local CETA prime sponsor planning process. The occupational unemployment data typically produced by the ES-203 program do, however, have a number of major limitations. First, as noted earlier in this chapter, the insured unemployed under regular state U.I. programs account for only a minority of the total number of unemployed, and in some low unemployment states, such as Texas and Virginia, the insured unemployed may account for only 20 percent of all the unemployed. In such cases, the utility of U.I. claimants data for examining employment conditions in specific occupations to gauge relative shortage or surplus situations is substantially diminished. Second there currently does not exist an occupational employment data base, particularly at the substate level, comparable to the occupational unemployment data from the ES-203 program. As a result, one cannot calculate insured unemployment rates by occupation at the state and substate area at this point in time.[187] Third, the geographic details provided by SESA's in their published reports on the occupational characteristics of the insured unemployed tend to vary from state to state and frequently are not produced by prime sponsor planning area. More detailed geographic breakouts of the data would be useful for CETA program planning purposes.[188] Fourth, the occupational detail provided in the published reports (1-digit DOT) is often too highly aggregated for local program planning purposes.[189] Finally, the accuracy of the occupational codes assigned to claimants by the U.I. claims clerks has been questioned. Publication of more detailed occupational data from the ES-203 survey will most likely have to be accompanied by efforts to bolster the size of the sample and improve the quality of the occupational coding process.

The third source of data on the occupational characteristics of the unemployed in state and selected local labor areas is that of the ESARS system described earlier in this chapter. Table 96 of the ESARS reporting system provides monthly information on the number of active job applicants in various occupations (classified by 3-digit and selected 6-digit and 9-digit DOT codes) as well as selected information on their demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.[190] These tables are typically published for states and major labor areas within states.

While the data on the occupational characteristics of ES active job applicants can potentially provide a useful source of information for CETA planning purposes, they are characterized by a number of limitations that must be taken into consideration by local planners. First, ES applicants comprise only a portion of all unemployed job seekers. During recent years, it has been estimated that between 25 percent and 30 percent of all unemployed job seekers in the U.S. utilize the ES as a source of information on jobs during their job search.[191] The relative degree of utilization of the Job Service also appears to vary substantially by state. Table 4-3A2 on the following pages provides information on the relative size of the ES applicant pool (cumulative number of new and renewed applicants) in each state during 1978. The size of the ES applicant pool in each state during that year varied as a percentage of the state civilian labor force from under 10 percent in Maryland, New Jersey, and New York to over 27 percent in such states as Alaska, Arkansas, D.C., Nevada, and New Mexico.

Second, not all of the active ES applicants are actually unemployed. Some may be employed either full-time or part-time while others may be registered with the ES offices, but not actively seeking work. This latter group would be classified as out of the labor force in the CPS household survey rather than unemployed. As a result of these possibilities, one cannot automatically assume that all of the ES active applicants in each occupational area are available for and actively seeking work. Third, the published data on the occupational characteristics of active ES job applicants are frequently limited to states and major labor areas. More detailed ESARS data relevant to the local CETA prime sponsor planning process can, however, be produced by reformatting the data contained on the state ES Applicant Master File.[192] Finally, the usefulness of all of the data on ES active job applicants is dependent upon the continuous purging from the files of inactive applicants.

Data and Information Sources on Non-CETA Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs

The needs of CETA prime sponsor planners for information on the numbers and types of classroom training and apprenticeship programs being administered in their local areas were outlined in Table 3-3B of the previous chapter. Available state and/or local data and information sources on public vocational education programs, proprietary occupationally-oriented training programs, occupational programs in two-year and four-year institutions of higher learning, and apprenticeship programs are reviewed in Table 4-3B[193]

Data on enrollments in and completions from public vocational education programs at the secondary and postsecondary level as well as data on the followup status of a sample of program completers and leavers are currently being produced by the states as part of the Vocational Education Data Accounting and Reporting System (VEDS).[194] The current reporting system developed in

Table 4-3A2: Estimates of the Civilian Labor Force and the Number of New and Renewed Applicants in ES Offices, by State: 1978

State	(A) Civilian Labor Force (In Thousands)	(B) New and Renewed Applicants (In Thousands)	(C) N & R / CLF
Alabama	1,592.0	358	.225
Alaska	180.0	62	.344
Arizona	993.0	251	.253
Arkansas	926.0	274	.296
California	10,632.0	1,258	.118
Colorado	1,292.0	226	.175
Connecticut	1,512.0	181	.120
Delaware	273.0	37	.136
D.C.	332.0	91	.274
Florida	3,689.0	540	.146
Georgia	2,315.0	363	.157
Hawaii	397.0	88	.222
Idaho	405.0	107	.264
Illinois	5,327.0	712	.134
Indiana	2,570.0	450	.175
Iowa	1,419.0	259	.183
Kansas	1,158.0	162	.140
Kentucky	1,555.0	276	.177
Louisiana	1,619.0	267	.165
Maine	473.0	72	.152
Maryland	2,031.0	160	.079
Massachusetts	2,836.0	302	.106
Michigan	4,202.0	746	.178
Minnesota	1,994.0	271	.136
Mississippi	996.0	260	.261
Missouri	2,262.0	396	.175
Montona	370.0	99	.268

Table 4-3A2: (continued)

State	(A) Civilian Labor Force (In Thousands)	(B) New and Renewed Applicants (In Thousands)	(C) N & R CLF
Nebraska	771.0	107	.139
Nevada	334.0	91	.272
New Hampshire	428.0	65	.152
New Jersey	3,431.0	317	.092
New Mexico	525.0	152	.290
New York	7,844.0	771	.098
North Carolina	2,679.0	435	.162
North Dakota	294.0	68	.231
Ohio	4,943.0	725	.147
Oklahoma	1,260.0	283	.225
Oregon	1,191.0	271	.228
Pennsylvania	5,252.0	649	.124
Puerto Rico	971.0	218	.225
Rhode Island	433.0	55	.127
South Carolina	1,298.0	231	.178
South Dakota	328.0	71	.216
Tennessee	1,926.0	272	.141
Texas	5,994.0	1,007	.168
Utah	540.0	141	.261
Vermont	236.0	55	.233
Virginia	2,429.0	357	.147
Washington	1,754.0	293	.167
West Virginia	720.0	154	.214
Wisconsin	2,305.0	354	.154
Wyoming	208.0	53	.255

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President, 1979: "Table D-3," p. 338, and "Table F-8," p. 370.

response to provisions in the 1976 Educational Amendments Act (Public Law 94-482) will, when fully implemented, provide annual data on the numbers and selected demographic characteristics of enrollments in and completions from various public vocational education programs classified by detailed Office of Education (O.E.) program codes.[195] In addition, each state vocational education agency is now required to conduct an annual one-year followup of a sample of program completers and selected leavers. The data on enrollment and completions will be reported annually on a statewide basis although the records of students are to be maintained in a form that would allow the data to be reported in a more disaggregated manner, including by Local Educational Agency (LEA). The student followup system is designed to collect data on the labor force and school enrollment status of graduates and selected programs leavers approximately one year following graduation. The occupations of the jobs held by students at the time of the followup will be coded by O.E. program on a two-digit SOC code basis.

The enrollment, completion, and followup data currently being compiled by the VEDS system does have a number of advantages over the previous vocational education program reporting system; however, they do have a number of shortcomings from a local CETA program planning perspective.[196] First, the VEDS enrollment and completion data will be reported to NCES on a statewide basis rather than by local labor area or LEA. The production of enrollment and completions data for the latter two areas is more relevant to the needs of CETA prime sponsors. Second, the VEDS reporting forms do not currently identify all individual O.E. programs administered by the public vocational education system.[197] Third, the enrollment and completions data being reported by the states to NCES apparently do not pertain to enrollments in and completions from all public vocational education programs being administered throughout the states. In some instances, only enrollments in those programs supported in part by federal vocational education funds are being reported. Fourth, the degree of occupational detail (2-digit SOC) that will be reported on the followup forms is limited, not allowing identification of the specific SOC occupations of the jobs held by students at the time of the followup contact. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the VEDS reporting system will not provide information on the particular schools in each state offering various types of vocational education programs, the level at which such programs are offered (secondary,

Table 4-3B: Data and Information Sources on Non-CETA Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs

Type of Information	(A) Information or Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data Sources	(E) Major Limitations of Data Source
Enrollments in and completions from public vocational education programs; Follow-up status of program graduates	Vocational Educational Data Accounting and Reporting System (VEDS)	Data reported to NCES on a statewide basis; Records of students to be maintained on an LEA basis	Annual	Numbers and selected demographic characteristics of enrollments in and completions from various vocational education programs classified by Office of Education (O.E.) program code; One year post-program follow-up status of a sample of students completing vocational education programs	. Limited geographic detail for the data reported to NCES . Incomplete program coverage on reporting forms . Incomplete coverage of public vocational education program enrollments and completions . Limited occupational detail on follow-up forms . Lack of information on entry criteria of programs and individual program performance
Enrollments, completions, and placements from programs administered by private training schools	State educational agencies, licensing departments or bureaus	Varies	Varies	Varies	. Variable coverage of private training programs . Incomplete and dated data on enrollments and completions . Limited information on occupational outputs of programs

Table 4-3B: (Continued)

Type of Information	(A) Information or Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data Sources	(E) Major Limitations of Data Source
	1980 Survey of the National Center for Educational Statistics	All proprietary schools in each state	Annual	Enrollments and completions by program type; sex characteristics of enrollments and completers	. Uncertain availability of published data on a substate basis . Lack of followup data for program completers and leavers . Lack of information on entry criteria for programs and individual program performance
Graduates from programs in two-year and four-year institutions of higher learning	Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS)	States and substate areas (Locations of institutions of higher learning are noted in reports)	Annual	Number of degrees awarded by programs classified by HEGIS program code; Selected demographic characteristics of completers every two years	. Lack of information on entry criteria for programs . Lack of close matching to occupational demand data . No information on placement or followup status of program completers
Enrollments in and completions from registered apprenticeship programs	State/National Apprenticeship Program System (SNAPS)	States	Annual	Number of individuals enrolled in and completing apprenticeship programs by occupation (9-digit DOT code); Selected demographic characteristics of enrollees and completers	. Lack of substate data on apprenticeship . Lack of information on entry criteria for apprenticeship programs . Lack of follow-up data on program completers

adult, postsecondary), the criteria for entry into such programs, or the performance of these individual programs in terms of placing graduates into jobs related to their field of training. The above types of information would more appropriately meet the basic planning needs of CETA prime sponsors.

Information on the occupational programs offered by private training institutions is currently available from several different sources. One such source of information are the private school licensing bureaus or agencies administered by state educational agencies. These agencies, such as the Office of Private Schools in Massachusetts, are responsible for licensing or approving occupational programs or private training institutions in the state. As part of the licensing process, data are often collected from private schools on the occupational characteristics of their training programs, enrollments, completions, and placements. The data collected by these agencies typically possess a number of deficiencies that limit their usefulness for prime sponsor planning purposes. Among their major limitations are their incomplete coverage of private school training programs, the lack of current and complete data on enrollments and completions in these programs, and the limited information that they provide on criteria for entry into the program and on the placement performance of individual programs, including the placement and retention of graduates in training-related fields.[198]

A second and more comprehensive source of information on postsecondary, noncollegiate private school training activities is provided by the national surveys of the National Center for Educational Statistics. Beginning in 1980, the National Center for Educational Statistics will survey the universe of postsecondary, noncollegiate private schools to obtain information on the number of enrollments and completions in occupational programs classified by U.S.O.E. program codes.[199] It is not certain at this time whether the NCES survey data will be used to provide information on the training activities of private postsecondary noncollegiate institutions for substate areas. The NCES survey also will not collect data on the placement and followup status of program completers. Thus, key data elements needed to assess the "demonstrated effectiveness" of such programs will not be produced by the survey.

Select information on occupational training programs administered by two-year and four-year institutions of higher learning is available from the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics.[200] In addition to providing information on bachelors and higher degrees, this survey collects data from all 2-year and 4-year colleges and universities on the number of associate degrees awarded each year in various program areas classified by HEGIS code.[201] The data on degrees conferred are collected every two years, with demographic information collected every two years. The data from the survey are published annually and are broken out by state and by individual college or university within the state.[202]

The HEGIS survey data are characterized by a number of limitations for program planning purposes. First, a number of the HEGIS program categories are quite broad covering a wide range of different occupations. This level of aggregation complicates the task of identifying the specific occupations for which individuals are being trained in these programs. Second, the survey does not obtain information on the admissions criteria for these programs, a critical informational element for CETA program planning, including the use of individual referrals to these programs.[203] Finally, the HEGIS survey does not obtain job placement or followup data for individuals receiving associate degrees or other formal awards from these institutions of higher learning.

Data on the numbers and occupations of individuals participating in registered apprenticeship programs in each state are collected and maintained by the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training System under the State/National Apprenticeship Program System (SNAPS). The SNAPS system provides data on the number of individuals enrolled in and completing apprenticeships that are registered with Federal or state apprenticeship agencies. The occupational areas of these apprenticeships are coded on the basis of 9-digit DOT codes. The reporting system also collects selected data on the demographic characteristics (sex/race) of participants and completions. The SNAPS data are not currently produced on a substate basis. The system also does not collect data on the followup status of program leavers or completers.[204]

The above review of available sources of data on non-CETA, occupationally-oriented classroom and apprenticeship training programs has revealed the diverse and complex nature of existing supply side data bases. Collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the data generated by these diverse reporting systems would provide a formidable challenge to the planning staffs of even the largest CETA prime sponsors. There is at this time a clear and substantial need for the development of a comprehensive system that would provide information on the number, nature, types, and performance of occupationally-oriented training programs in state and local areas for use in the planning of training programs under CETA and the public vocational education system. A more detailed description of the features of this institutional training program information system (not to be confused with comprehensive occupational supply/demand matching systems) will be presented in the concluding chapter of this report.[204a] In addition to the above types of information, more substantive research efforts should be devoted to understanding the specific sources of labor supply relied upon by private sector firms and public agencies within local labor areas to meet their manpower needs in specific occupational areas relevant to the CETA and public vocational education training system.[205]

Information on the Occupational Outputs of Local CETA Employment and Training Programs

Table 3-4 of the preceding chapter of this report provided a summary listing and description of desirable types of information on the immediate, short-term, and longer-term outcomes of local CETA employment and training programs, with major emphasis placed upon the occupational employment and earned income experiences of terminees in the postprogram period. A listing and brief description of available data sources on outcomes of CETA employment and training programs are presented in table 4-4 on the following pages. The table provides a brief description of the primary characteristics and the major limitations of the data provided by each source. All CETA prime sponsors are required to prepare and submit to the regional offices of ETA on a quarterly basis summary reports on program activities by CETA title and subpart. Two of these reports, the CETA Program Status Summary and the Quarterly Summary of Participant Characteristics, provide information on the cumulative numbers and types of terminations from local prime sponsor programs under each CETA title and subpart.[206] The Program Status Summary provides data on the cumulative numbers of enrollments and terminations, including the number of terminees entering unsubsidized

Table 4-4: Available Data Sources on the Outputs of CETA Employment and Training Programs

Type of Data	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data Source	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Terminations from CETA employment and training programs	CETA Program Status Summary (PSS); Quarterly Summary of Participant Characteristics (QSPC)	Prime sponsor planning area	Quarterly	Cumulative number of terminations from each CETA title and subpart; Types of terminations from each CETA title and subpart, including numbers of terminees entering unsubsidized employment; Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of terminees and those entering employment by CETA title; Distribution of hourly wages of jobs obtained by terminees by title and subpart	. No information on the major program activities from which terminees entered employment . No information on the occupations or industries of the jobs obtained by terminees No information on the followup status of terminees
Types of terminations from CETA programs by title, subpart, and major activity	Annual CETA Program Activity Summary	Prime sponsor areas	Annual (First reports not available until December 1980)	Data on the number of individuals terminating from CETA program by title, subpart, and major activity; Data on types of terminations from each of the above program categories, including placements in the private and public sectors of the economy	. No information on the occupations or industries of jobs obtained by terminees No information on the hourly wages and hours of work of jobs obtained by terminees . No information on followup status of terminees

Table 4-4: (Continued)

Type of Data	(A) Data Source	(B) Geographic Coverage	(C) Frequency of Publication	(D) Primary Characteristics of Data Source	(E) Major Limitations of Data
Termination status and postprogram employment and earnings experiences of CETA participants in selected types of program activities	Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS)	National sample of CETA participants (20,000 participants added to sample annually in recent years)	Varies, depending on type of report	Information on the characteristics of individuals participating in various types of CETA programs (e.g., OJT, classroom skills training, work experience, PSE); Data on the program labor force, employment, earnings, and income experiences of participants up to three years after initial date of enrollment; Data are also collected on occupations and industries of jobs obtained by terminees	. Time lags between program ending dates and availability of followup data . No geographic identifiers for states or individual prime sponsors . Unable to identify relationship of program outcomes to specific types of programs, e.g. occupational areas in which training was provided
Followup status of CETA terminees	Prime sponsor followup surveys	Prime sponsor and/or subgrantee area	Varies	Varies substantially	. Variations in participation by prime sponsors . Substantial variations in design and timing of surveys and types of data collected . Limited information on occupational characteristics of jobs obtained, occupational mobility in postprogram period, gross earnings in postprogram period, or net gains in earned incomes

employment, from each CETA title and subpart.[207] While this reporting form is also used to provide data on the cumulative number of enrollments in major program activities under each title (i.e., OJT, classroom training, work experience, etc.), it does not provide breakouts of the numbers of individuals obtaining unsubsidized employment by major program activity.

The Quarterly Summary of Participant Characteristics (QSPC) provides data on the demographic, socioeconomic, and pre-CETA labor force characteristics of all terminees and those entering unsubsidized employment for each CETA title and subpart. This reporting form is also used to present data on the aggregate distribution of hourly wages of the jobs obtained by terminees for each CETA Title and subpart. The QSPC does not, however, provide any information on the occupations or industries of the jobs obtained by CETA program terminees or on the followup status of terminees.

To overcome some of the deficiencies of the above reporting forms, the Employment and Training Administration has recently designed a new annual report known as the Annual CETA Program Activity Summary.[208] This report (to be prepared by all CETA prime sponsors by December 1980) will provide data on the numbers and types of terminations by major program activity for each CETA title and subpart. The terminations categories include separate breakouts of those entering employment in the public and private sectors of the economy. The annual report will not, however, provide any information on the occupations or industries of jobs obtained by program terminees, the hourly wages and hours of work of jobs obtained by terminees, or their labor force, employment, and earnings experiences in the postprogram period.

The Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor has funded a longitudional survey of a nationally representative sample of CETA program participants in selected types of employment and training activities to produce data on their postprogram employment and earnings experiences. This longitudinal survey known as the Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS) is conducted by Westat, Inc. and the Bureau of the Census for the Office of Policy, Evaluation, and Research of the Employment and Training Administration.[209]

The survey has conducted initial interviews with a national sample of approximately 20,000 CETA participants on an annual basis during recent years.[210]

The survey is designed to collect data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of participants in various CETA programs and to obtain detailed data on their in-program experiences and their postprogram labor force, employment, and earnings experience for a period of three years following their initial date of enrollment in the CETA system.[211] Actual changes in the pre-post-program employment and earnings experiences of CETA participants are currently being compared to those of comparison groups to determine the net employment and earnings impacts of participation in various types of CETA employment and training programs.[212]

The CLMS will eventually provide a comprehensive data base for determining the postprogram labor force, employment, and earnings experiences of CETA program terminees, including a capability for deriving estimates of the net impacts of participation in various programs. The potential usefulness of this data base for *local* CETA prime sponsor policymaking and program planning purposes is likely to be limited by the following factors. First, there are currently considerable time lags between the time at which individuals initially enter the CETA system and the time at which the results of the longitudinal survey with respect to the net impacts of program participation become available. In a system such as CETA, characterized by rapid changes in program structure and operations, such lengthy delays will reduce the utility of the findings of the analysis for current local policymaking and program planning.[213] Second, while public use tapes from the CLMS survey will be made available to the research community, there apparently will not be any geographic identifiers for prime sponsor planning areas or states. Only broad geographic regions will be identified on these tapes. Third, the analysis of the CLMS data by themselves will likely be unable to identify the nature and magnitude of the relationships between program impacts and specific types of program treatments, including the nature and occupational characteristics of training services received by participants. Yet, it is precisely these types of findings that are most useful for planning the future mix and content of CETA employment and training programs at the state and local level.

CETA prime sponsors have also been involved in conducting their own local followup surveys. While the 1978 CETA reauthorization legislation provided some encouragement for local prime sponsors to become more actively involved in program evaluation efforts, it neither required them to do so nor authorized specific monies for such purposes. The current followup surveys of CETA prime sponsors tend to vary substantially from one another in terms of their purposes, design, administration, timing, and analysis. Some of the followup surveys simply attempt to capture information on the labor force status of job placed terminees in a relatively short time period (30, 60, 90 days) following their termination from the local CETA system. Other followup efforts, including those of many New England CETA prime sponsors,[214] are designed to track in a comprehensive manner the entire labor force, employment, wages, and earnings experiences of all terminees from Title II B and selected Title IV youth programs in a six-month period following termination.[215]

As noted in Chapter 3, ETA and NOICC are currently involved in a number of efforts to develop a local prime sponsor reporting system that would provide information on the immediate occupational outputs of CETA-related classroom and OJT training programs as required by provisions of the 1978 CETA legislation.[216] There simultaneously exists a need to bolster the followup evaluation capabilities of local prime sponsors. The recommendations of the authors with respect to the development of such a local evaluation capability will be presented in the concluding chapter of this report.

Chapter 4: Footnotes

1. The major shortcomings of each of these data sources will be outlined in column E of these tables.

2. See: i) 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, "Section 312 (a)";

   ii) 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Section 312 (a)."

   Both the 1973 and 1978 acts also called upon the Secretary of Labor to develop estimates of "labor demand" at the national, state, local, and poverty area level. Neither of the acts provided a vigorous discussion of either the components of a comprehensive labor market information system or the concepts of "labor demand." It is not clear whether "labor demand" referred to current employment by occupation and industry, the number and occupational characteristics of current job openings, or the number and occupational characteristics of projected job openings.

3. For a brief overview of major features of ETA's Labor Market Information program,

   See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, The Labor Market Information System of the Employment and Training Administration, Washington, D.C., 1976;

   ii) U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Manpower Report of the President: 1975, pp. 93-95;

   iii) U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, pp. 51-52.

4. For example, the Employment and Training Administration has recently developed methodologies involving the use of ESARS data and data produced by the 1976 Survey of Income and Education for estimating the sex, age, and racial/ethnic characteristics of individuals eligible for various CETA programs by prime sponsor planning area.

   See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Guidelines for the Development of Labor Market Information Needed for CETA Planning Purposes, 1979.

5. Copies of the actual questionnaires used in collecting data from households during the 1970 Census can be found in the following publication:

   U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Detailed Characteristics: U.S. Summary, PC (1) -D1, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973.

6. Examples of the volumes produced by the Bureau of the Census for each state of the nation include the following:

   i) U.S. Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics: Massachusetts, PC (1) - C23, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972;

   ii) U.S. Bureau of the Census, Detailed Characteristics: Massachusetts, PC (1) - D23, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973.

7. For example,

   See: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, A Custom-Made Manpower Data Report: Summary Manpower Indicators for Fall River Labor Market Area, Massachusetts, Lawerence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California, undated.

8. For a review of the estimated undercount of the 1970 U.S. population by sex, age, and race,

   See: McCarthy, Philip J., "Some Sources of Error in Labor Force Estimates from the Current Population Survey," in Data Collection, Processing, and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 1-39.

9. The public use tapes containing micro-records from the 1970 Census provided identifiers only for states, SMSA's and counties. Cities and towns comprising prime sponsor planning and subgrantee areas could not be identified.

   See: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Public Use Samples of Basic Records from the 1970 Census: Description and Technical Documentation, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972.

10. The coverage of the 1970 Census and the 1976 SIE differed from one another in several key respects. First, unlike the 1970 Census, the SIE did not attempt to obtain data on inmates of institutions, such as prisons and nursing homes. Second, only those members of the armed forces who lived off base were covered by the 1976 SIE while the 1970 Census also included members of the armed forces living in military barracks. Finally, the SIE counted college students living away from home as residents of the area in which their family home was located rather than the area in which their college or university was located.

    See: i) Manka, Paul T., Op. cit., p. C-5;

    ii) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Money Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the Northeast Region, by Divisions and States, (Spring 1976 Survey of Income and Education), U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

11. The bulk of the interviews for the SIE survey were conducted during the months of May and June, with additional interviews taking place in late

April and early July.

See: Manka, Paul T., Op. cit., p. C-3.

12. Sample size limitations for substate areas do lead to increased standard errors for their population and labor force estimates. For a review of the estimated sample errors of the estimates by state,

See: Manka, Paul T., Op. cit., pp. A-7 to A-28.

For examples of the types of population, labor force, incomes, and earnings data produced on the basis of the SIE survey data,

See:
- i) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Money Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the Northeast Region, by Divisions and States...;
- ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Selected Socioeconomic Indicators from the 1976 SIE: Package No. 1, Washington, D.C., 1979;
- iii) Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Manpower Data Packages for Planning and Training Programs Based Upon the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Boston, June 1978.

13. A few states have also used data from the LBL models as inputs into projections of longer-term changes in their populations and labor forces. For example,

See: Steller, Mary Ellen and Maloy, Peter, Population and Labor Force Projections for Massachusetts, Labor Area Research, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, 1980.

14. See: Nelson, Barbara and Dailey, Martha, Annual Planning Information Report, Fiscal Year 1979, Boston, Massachusetts Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, 1978.

15. For a review of the concepts and procedures used in conducting the CPS household survey, including sample sizes by state in recent years,

See:
- i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, pp. 5-23;
- ii) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 127-152;
- iii) Goldstein, Harold, "State and Local Labor Force Statistics," in Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 411-465.

16. The monthly findings of the CPS household survey with respect to the size of the civilian labor and the number of employed and unemployed persons in these areas are published in Employment and Earnings.

    See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, March 1979, "Table E-1," pp. 133-137.

17. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment: States, 1978 and Metropolitan Areas, 1977-78, Report 571, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

18. For a review of the major features of the LAUS program and a critique of its technical shortcomings,

    See:
    - i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, pp. 62-65;
    - ii) Goldstein, Harold, "State and Local Labor Force Statistics," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 411-465;
    - iii) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 229-265.

19. A copy of the questionnaire utilized in conducting the 1976 SIE survey can be found in the following publication:

    U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Money Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the Northeast Region, pp. 177-184.

    Findings of the SIE survey with respect to the size and characteristics of the civilian labor force in Massachusetts in the spring of 1976 appear in the following publications:
    - i) Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew; CETA Planning Package for Massachusetts: Findings from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979;
    - ii) Bouba, Maryann and Sum, Andrew, Targetting CETA Resources: An Analysis of the Demographic and Labor Force Characteristics...

20. See:
    - i) Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew; Op. cit.;
    - ii) Bouba, Maryann and Sum, Andrew, The Extent of Job Desires of Persons Outside of the Labor Force...

21. See: Nelson, Barbara, and Dailey, Martha, Op. cit., pp. 97, 100, 103.

22. The age/sex groups for whom civilian labor force, employment, and unemployment data are produced by the BLS are teens 16-19 (both sexes combined), males 20+ and females 20+. For selected states and metropolitan areas with large minority populations, labor force data are also provided for blacks and Hispanics. For example, 1978 annual average labor force data for the Hispanic population were only published for 6 states and 6 SMSA's.

    See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment*: *States, 1978 and Metropolitan Areas, 1977-78*, Report 571.

23. The monthly CPS survey does collect data on the industrial attachment of the employed; however, these data are not published for states or major SMSA's in the *Geographic Profiles*. For a review of the CPS questions on industry employment,

    See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *BLS Handbook of Methods*, Bulletin 1910, p. 16.

24. Employment data also were collected for 14-15 year olds during the survey. For a review of the types of data on employed persons that can be generated by the microdata tapes of the SIE,

    See: Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward, and Sum, Andrew; *Op. cit*.

25. *See*: Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, *Manpower Data Packages for Planning Employment and Training Programs Based Upon the 1976 Survey of Income and Education*, Boston, June 1978, "Tables 24 and 25."

26. *See*: Nelson, Barbara and Dailey, Martha, *Op. cit*., pp. 97, 100, 103.

27. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Geographic Profiles of Employment and Unemployment*: *States, 1978 and Metropolitan Areas, 1977-78*, Report 571, pp. 30-32, 54-54.

    The data on durations of unemployment refer to the durations of ongoing spells of unemployment rather than to actual completed spells. For a more detailed discussion of the differences between these two measures,

    See: Kaitz, Hyman B., "Analyzing the Length of Spells of Unemployment," *Monthly Labor Review Reader*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1868, 1975, pp. 36-45.

28. For a detailed overview of the methods used in generating these monthly unemployment estimates,

    See: Goldstein, Harold, "State and Local Labor Force Statistics," in *Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local*, pp. 412-465.

29. See: Mangum, Garth L., "Employment/Unemployment Statistics and the CETA Prime Sponsor," in Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 473-490.

A critique of the use of unemployment data in allocating federal manpower and economic development monies to economically depressed areas, particularly rural areas, can be found in the following publications:

i) Tweeten, Luther, "Rural Employment and Unemployment Statistics," in Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 527-560;

ii) Briggs, Vernon, M., "Comments on the Luther Tweeten Paper," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 561-63;

iii) Martin, Philip L., "Comments on the Luther Tweeten Paper," Data Collection Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 563-566.

30. The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics has recommended that monthly LAUS unemployment data not be used to allocate national CETA monies among prime sponsors,

See: National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 14-15.

31. As a result of the absence of LAUS-related data on the demographic characteristics of the unemployed, allocations of national CETA monies for programs targeted to specific demographic groups, such as the YEDPA employment and training programs, must be based upon estimates of total unemployment within CETA prime sponsor planning areas. As Susan Grayson, Staff Director of the House Employment Opportunities Subcommittee, has noted:

"For a youth unemployment bill, it is logical to distribute funds on the basis of youth unemployment, but there are no good local figures on youth unemployment."

See: Duscha, Julius, "Employment Statistics and the Congress," in Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 393-409.

32. It should be noted that the SIE survey was conducted over a time period spanning four different calendar months (April-July) rather than being confined to a single week as is true of the CPS household survey. The reference week for the SIE survey, thus, varies among individuals. As a result, the unemployment rates derived from the SIE survey data are actually representative of "average" unemployment rates over the time period covered by the survey.

For a review of the findings of the SIE survey with respect to estimated unemployment levels and rates for age, sex, and racial/ethnic groups in Massachusetts,

See: Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew: CETA Planning Packages for Massachusetts: Findings of the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, "Table 1-6 and 1-7."

33. Estimates of the numbers and selected demographic characteristics of the long-term unemployed in Massachusetts appear in the following publication:

Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Manpower Data Packages for Planning Employment and Training Programs Based Upon the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Boston, 1978, "Table 12."

34. The LMPM model is also used to produce estimates of the total number of different individuals expected to encounter one or more spells of unemployment in the forthcoming fiscal year and to provide estimates of the annual average number and sex/racial-ethnic characteristics of the long-term unemployed,

See: Nelson, Barbara and Dailey, Martha, Op. cit., pp. 99, 102, 105.

For a more detailed discussion of stock/flow unemployment relationships and their implications for planning employment and training programs,

See: Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training Programs at the Local Level, Vol. 2: The Role of Process, Outcome, and Benefit-Cost Evaluations, "Appendix A and B."

35. Unemployment rate estimates based upon the CPS household survey for a given fiscal year could be compared to the projected unemployment rates based upon the LMPM projections model for states and major SMSA's. The unemployment data published in the Geographic Profiles would simply have to be broken out at a finer level of detail by age and sex and converted to a fiscal year rather than a calendar year basis.

36. For a more detailed discussion of the features and potential uses of unemployment insurance data for CETA program planning purposes,

See:
- i) Blaustein, Saul J., "Insured Unemployment Data," in Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 197-253;
- ii) Ganz, Russell and Sum, Andrew, The Role of Unemployment Insurance Based Data Sources in Planning Employment and Training Programs, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

37. A discussion of potential planning uses of U.I. claimants data on a prime sponsor and subgrantee planning area basis appears in the following publications:

   i) Harrison, Bennett; Kelley, Maryellen; Skilnyk, Anastasia; and Sum, Andrew; *A Manual for CETA Prime Sponsors on the Monitoring and Evaluation of Title I Programs for Employment and Training*, Second Edition, National Civil Service League, Washington, D.C., 1976;

   ii) Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; Meehan, Edward; Tortora, Frank; and Harrington, Charles; *Sources and Uses of Local Labor Market Information for CETA Title I Program Planning Purposes*, Northeastern University, Department of Economics, Boston, 1977.

38. For an overview of the features of the ES-203 program,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *BLS Handbook of Methods*, Bulletin, 1970, pp. 74-76.

39. It should be noted that administrative responsibility for the ES-203 program was returned to the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor in 1979. The survey had previously been administered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics between 1972-1979.

40. The minimum sample size required of states is a function of the overall size of the monthly claimants caseload. Some states have collected U.I. claimants data on a sample basis at a rate far greater than that required by the BLS procedures to produce more detailed profiles of U.I. claimants at a state and substate level. For more details on the sampling procedures,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *BLS Handbook of Methods*, Bulletin 1980, pp. 74-75.

Data on the numbers and selected characteristics of U.I. claimants within the U.S. and individual states are produced by the Employment and Training Administration. These publications also include data on the number of individuals receiving U.I. benefits under other programs, including Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees (JCFE), Unemployment Compensation for Ex-Servicement (UCX), and Extended Benefits Programs, such as TREX.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *Unemployment Insurance Statistics*, July-September 1978, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

41. For example,

See: i) State of Vermont, Department of Employment Security, *Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed: Vermont and Its Labor Market Areas, March 1980*, 1980;

ii) Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed: August 1976, Boston, 1976.

42. For a more detailed discussion of the role of economic factors and U.I. eligibility rules in influencing the degree of the coverage of U.I. claimants,

See: i) Ganz, Russell and Sum, Andrew, The Role of Unemployment Insurance-Based Data Sources...;

ii) Green, Gloria P., "Comparing Total and State-Insured Unemployment," Monthly Labor Review, June 1971.

43. See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, "Table A-1," p. 233 and "Table D-5," p. 340.

44. Several other data bases on worker earnings currently exist or are being constructed at this point in time. The 39 states that have individual wage reporting by establishments covered by the state's unemployment insurance laws do have a capability of capturing data on the earnings of workers from employment in covered establishments. The earnings data are reported by establishments to the SESA's on a quarterly basis; however, once a worker reaches the maximum limit for U.I. tax purposes ($6,000 to $6,500 in most states) the earnings data for that worker for the remainder of the year are no longer reported by the establishment. Earnings data from this reporting system in Oklahoma are currently being utilized by the Oklahoma SOICC to determine the feasibility of collecting appropriate follow-up information for graduates of public vocational education programs, proprietary training programs, and CETA classrooms skills training programs.

The Unemployment Insurance Division of ETA has been involved in an effort to develop a national Continuous Wage Benefit History (CWBH) data base in cooperation with the SESA's. This data base would contain information on the covered earnings and employment experiences of a sample of workers collecting U.I. benefits. The survey would be longitudinal in nature and would track an individual worker's employment and earnings experiences over a 5- to 7-year period. For a more detailed discussion of the structure and features of the above two earnings data systems,

See: i) Stevens, David, "Performance Measurement in the CETA System," CETA: An Analysis of the Issues, pp. 217-241;

ii) Borus, Michael E., "Data Needed to Measure the Impact of Public Programs," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 471-503;

iii) Kleiner, Morris M., "An Appraisal of New Data Sources for State and Area Estimates," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 99-126.

45. The annual findings of the March CPS supplement with respect to the civilian labor force, employment, and unemployment experiences of individuals are published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in a series of Special Labor Force Reports.

See: i) Young, Anne McDougall, *Work Experience of the Population in 1977*, Special Labor Force Report 224, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1979;

ii) Young, Anne McDougall, *Work Experience of the Population in 1976*, BLS Special Labor Force Report 201, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1977.

46. The findings of the survey with respect to the earnings and incomes of individuals, households, and families are published by the Bureau of the Census in the series P-60 Current Population Reports.

See: i) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1976*, Series P-60, No. 107, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977;

ii) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1975*, Series P-60, No. 106, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

47. The data have also been used to analyze the degree of inequality in the earnings distributions of men and women throughout the nation. An analysis of trends in the degree of inequality in the earnings distributions of various groups of workers can be found in the following publications,

i) Henle, Peter, "Exploring the Distribution of Earned Income," *Monthly Labor Review*, December 1972, pp. 16-27;

ii) Henle, Peter and Ryscavage, Paul, "The Distribution of Earnings Among Men and Women," *Monthly Labor Review*, April 1980, pp. 3-10.

48. The Bureau of the Census has only tended to provide yearly estimates of the annual earnings of workers and of the incomes of households and families residing in broad Census regions,

See: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Money Income in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States*, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 105, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

49. *See*: i) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty*.

50. *See*: i) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the Northeast Region, by Divisions and States*, Series P-60, No. 110;

ii) Mazzeo, Katherine and Sum, Andrew, *Trends in the Money Income and Poverty Status of Massachusetts Families, 1969-1975: Implications for Targetting CETA Related Employment and Training Programs*, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

51. *See*: i) Bouba, Maryann and Sum, Andrew, *Targetting CETA Resources: An Analysis of the Demographic and Labor Force Characteristics of Massachusetts Family Heads Potentially Eligible for CETA-Related Employment and Training Services*, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978;

ii) Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; Sum, Andrew; *CETA Planning Package for Massachusetts: Findings from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education*, "Tables 3-3, 3-4, 3-6, 3-7;"

iii) Vinson, Robert and Ganz, Russell, "Employment and Earnings Inadequacy in Massachusetts and New England," *Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning, and Education*, pp. 125-152.

52. For a more detailed description of the CWHS data base and the findings of the survey (together with earnings data provided by the Railroad Retirement Board) with respect to the earnings of American workers by sex, age, race, quarters of employment, and industry,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Annual Earnings and Employment Patterns of Private Nonagricultural Employees: 1973-75*, Bulletin 2031, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Annual Earnings and Employment Patterns of Private Nonagricultural Employees, 1971 and 1972*, Bulletin 1928, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976;

iii) Vroman, Wayne, "Worker Upgrading and the Business Cycle," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, Vol. 1, 1977, pp. 229-257.

53. *See*: i) Vroman, Wayne, *Op. cit*.;

ii) Schiller, Bradley R., "Relative Earnings Mobility in the United States," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 67, No. 5, December 1977, pp. 926-940.

54. The number of persons (16+) with some work experience during 1976 has been estimated at a level of 104,219,000. The Bureau of the Census has estimated that 74,142,000 households existed in the U.S. during that same year. Thus, the average number of persons (16+) with work experience per household would be approximately 1.41 during 1976. Given that 56,000 households were interviewed during the March 1977 Work Experience Survey, data would be available for approximately 80,000 persons (16+) with work experience during that year. This number of persons is only one-twelfth the size of the sample of persons for whom earnings information exists on the CWHS file,

See: i) Young, Anne McDougall, Work Experience of the Population in 1976, Special Labor Force Report 201, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977;

ii) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1976, Series P-60, No. 107, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

55. For a review of the literature on "primary" and "secondary" labor markets,

See: i) Harrison, Bennett and Sum, Andrew, Labor Market Data Needs from the Perspective of 'Dual' or 'Segmented' Labor Market Research, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Background Paper No. 29, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979;

ii) Harrison, Bennett and Sum, Andrew, "The Theory of 'Dual' or 'Segmented' Labor Markets," Journal of Economic Issues, September 1979, pp. 687-706.

Arthur J. Alexander has used the CWHS data to examine the age-earnings profiles of workers in various industries.

See: i) Alexander, Arthur J., Structure, Income, and Race: A Study in Internal Labor Markets, Santa Monica, Rand Corporation, 1970;

ii) Alexander, Arthur J., "Income, Experience, and the Structure of Internal Labor Markets," Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 56, (February 1974), pp. 63-86.

56. See: Schiller, Bradley R., Op. cit. The problem of incomplete earnings data for workers who reached the maximum limit on taxable U.I. income also exists for individual wage records submitted by employers covered by state U.I. laws.

57. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Annual Earnings and Employment Patterns of Private Nonagricultural Employees, 1973-75, p. 2.

58. For a review of some of the empirical findings on relative earnings mobility of American workers,

See: i) Schiller, Bradley R., Op. cit.;

ii) Schiller, Bradley R., "Equality, Opportunity, and the 'Good Job'," The Public Interest, Spring 1976, pp. 111-120.

59. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook, pp. III-18, III-23, III-29, III-35, III-41, III-49, and III-55.

60. For a review of the various definitions of the concept of "economically disadvantaged,"

See: i) Myers, Charles A., Op. cit.;

ii) Sum, Andrew and Leicher, Susan, Recruiting, Training, and Retraining the Disadvantaged Worker: The NAB JOBS Training Program Experience Within Harvard University, 1970-74, Cambridge, 1975;

iii) Sum, Andrew; Meehan, Edward; and Ganz, Russell; "The Economically Disadvantaged in New England: Implication for Targetting CETA Resources," in Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning and Evaluation.

61. To determine whether an individual is a member of an economically disadvantaged household or family, one must have data on both annual income of that household, the size of the household, and the sources of income for that household. Data on the size and sources of household and family income and the size of the household are available on the SIE tapes. Estimates of the appropriate income level to represent 70 percent of the BLS lower living standard budget for each household size and each state and substate area identified on the tapes must be made by the analyst on the basis of existing BLS budget data and ETA guidelines for the use of that data. For an illustration of the uses of such data in estimating the numbers and characteristics of the economically disadvantaged in New England,

See: Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew; Uses of Data from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education...

The documentation for the March 1979 CPS Survey's public use tapes including a description of the geographic areas identified on the tapes appears in the following publication:

Current Population Survey, March 1979 Technical Documentation, prepared by Data Access and Use Staff, Data User Services Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., The Bureau, 1980.

62. For an example of the types of regional and state analyses that have been made of the March CPS data,

See: Bokan, Marianne; Drago, Jack; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew; The Poor and the Unemployed in New England in 1977 Findings of the March 1977 Work Experience Survey, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

63. See:

i) Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; Sum, Andrew; CETA Planning Package for Massachusetts: Findings of the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, "Table 3-2 through 3-7;"

ii) Sum, Andrew; Meehan, Edward, and Ganz, Russell; "The Economically Disadvantaged in New England: Implications for Targetting CETA Resources."

64. For examples of such efforts at the national, regional, and state level,

See:

i) Barnes, William, "Target Groups," in CETA: An Analysis of the Issues, National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 23, pp. 63-104;

ii) Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russell; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew; CETA Planning Package for New England: Findings from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979;

iii) Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew; CETA Planning Package for Connecticut: Findings from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

65. See: Nelson, Barbara and Dailey, Martha, Op. cit., pp. 98, 101, 104.

66. For an overview of this system including definitions of data elements and descriptions of the reports produced routinely by the system,

See: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Guide to the Use of ESARS: The Employment Security Automated Reporting System, Boston, 1976.

67. See:

i) Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Characteristics of Applicants Registered in Employment Service Offices and Selected Employment Services Activities, Massachusetts: Cumulative October 1978 Through September 1979, Boston, 1979;

ii) Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Characteristics of Applicants Registered in Employment Service Offices and Selected Employment Service Activities, Massachusetts: Cumulative October 1979 Through March 1980, Boston, 1980.

It should be noted that the utility of the applicant data in the active file is dependent upon the degree to which the local SESA offices keep the files up to date; i.e., purge the active file of those individuals who have not recently come into the local office for further employment assistance.

68. For more details on the usefulness of ESARS outputs for CETA program planning purposes,

See: Ganz, Russell, Applications of the Employment Security Automated Reporting System (ESARS) for Targetting CETA Resources at the Local Level, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1979.

69. Comparison of spring 1976 ESARS active applicant data for Massachusetts with SIE-based estimates of the economically disadvantaged population in the state revealed that approximately 40 percent of the total economically disadvantaged population (16+) were registered with the Job Service. The coverage of the ESARS data varied sharply by the age group of the economically disadvantaged, ranging from 65 percent of those 25-45 to only 10 percent of those 65 and over.

See: Ganz, Russ, Op. cit., pp. 2-3.

70. For a discussion of the technical issues involved in producing these types of tables and an illustration of the alternative types of tables that can be produced for CETA planning purposes,

See: i) Ganz, Russell, Op. cit.

Special tabulations of ESARS data on the characteristics of economically disadvantaged applicants and other CETA target groups, including Vietnam-era and disabled veterans, were produced by ETA for use by CETA prime sponsors.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, FY 1978 Characteristics of ES Job Applicants, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

71. The application form collects information allowing one to classify applicants into one of the following three employment status categories: "full-time employment," "part-time employment," and "not working." The last category includes individuals who are unemployed as well as those who are out of the labor force. Registration with the Job Service does not imply that one is actually actively looking for a job. Some applicants may simply be seeking conseling services, testing services, or training information while others may be registering simply to comply with the provisions for continued receipt of AFDC benefits or food stamps. For further details on ESARS terms and their definitions,

See: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Guide to the Use of ESARS, pp. 53-79.

72. The methodology is designed to produce estimates of the percentage distribution of CETA eligibles by age, sex, and racial/ethnic group rather than estimates of the absolute numbers of CETA eligible individuals in each of the above demographic groups.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Guidelines for the Development of Labor Market Information Needed for CETA Planning Purposes.

73. Industry employment data are also available from County Business Patterns publications and from the industry censuses of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The County Business Patterns data, while establishment-based and quite comprehensive in coverage, are produced only once per year, and the publications date typically lags two years behind the year to which the data pertain. The industry censuses are conducted only once every five years. Thus, the employment data produced by the two surveys are characterized by serious shortcomings with respect to their timeliness for use in planning local CETA employment and training programs. For further descriptions of the nature of these surveys and their products,

See: i) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1972 Census of Manufacturing, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976;

ii) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1972 Census of Retail Trade, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976;

iii) U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, 1975: Massachusetts, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

74. For more detailed descriptions of the establishment survey and recommendations for improving its usefulness for policymaking,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 26-42;

ii) Wolfbein, Seymour L., "Employers' Reports on Employment, Hours, and Earnings in their Establishments," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 49-98;

iii) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 153-170.

75. Estimates of nonagricultural wage and salary employment by industry are available for the nation as a whole at a much more detailed level. The national estimates are published on a monthly basis in the BLS publication, Employment and Earnings.

76. The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics has recommended to the Secretary of Labor that monthly estimates of aggregate nonagricultural wage and salary employment be provided for all SMSA's and balance of state areas throughout the nation. In his interim report to the Congress, the Secretary of Labor has approved this recommendation. Neither report, however, addressed the issue of the desirable level of industry detail for these wage and salary employment estimates for substate areas.

See: i) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 10, 18;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Secretary, Interim Report of the Secretary of Labor on the Recommendations of the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, p. 25.

77. For a review of the factors influencing these revisions as well as sources of discrepancies between BLS-790 and CPS employment change estimates for Massachusetts,

See: Sum, Andrew and Winer, Eliot, Employment and Income Development in Massachusetts, 1974-77, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

78. In New England, the Federal Reserve Bank provides seasonally adjusted estimates of nonagricultural wage and salary employment for each state and major labor areas. The BLS-790 wage and salary data are provided to the Federal Reserve Bank by the SESA's in the region. The seasonal adjustments are provided for only a limited number of industry sectors in each state and are quite limited for local labor areas.

See: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, New England Economic Indicators, November 1979, Boston, pp. B-2 to B-4.

79. For a more detailed review of the ES-202 survey's features,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 66-73.

80. The employment data requested from employers are supposed to represent the number of workers receiving wages for the payroll period containing the 12th of the month. For a more detailed description of the forms utilized by the SESA's in collecting these employment data,

See: Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; Jantzen, Robert; and Vinson, Robert; The Distribution of Establishments by Employment Size-Class Within Covered Industries in the Boston SMSA During 1975, DES Labor Supply Project: Working Paper Number Ten, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, 1976.

81. For examples of such publications,

See: i) Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Employment and Wages in Massachusetts and the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, 1970-1974, Boston, 1975;

ii) Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Employment and Wages in Cities and Town, 1967-1978, Boston, 1979.

82. Examples of such ES-202 data products can be found in the following publications:

i) Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Quarterly Industry Employment Data for Employment and Training Program Planning Purposes, by Prime Sponsor and Subgrantee Area, 1976-78, Boston, 1979;

ii) Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Selected Growth Industries, Occupations, and Public Vocational Education Completions, by Major Labor Market Area, Boston, January 1980.

83. In 1978, as a result of the expansion of the U.I. system, 97 percent of all wage and salary employment is covered by the Federal-state U.I. system.

See: Hickey, Joseph A., "Unemployment Insurance Covers Additional 9 Million Workers," Monthly Labor Review, July 1978, pp. 14-17.

84. For a discussion of the impact of these noneconomic changes upon the ES-202 data base,

See: Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Quarterly Industry Employment Data for Employment and Training Program Planning Purposes, Major Labor Market Areas, 1975-1978, Boston, 1979.

85. The potential usefulness of the ES-202 data base for a wide variety of research and planning purposes has been recognized by others, who believe that the system should be more carefully scrutinized by the Federal government and that financial responsibility for its operation should be placed in the hands of the BLS.

See: i) Wolfbein, Seymour, Op. cit., pp. 59-60;

ii) Ehrenhalt, Samuel, "Comments on the Wolfbein Paper," Data Collection Processing Presentation: National and Local, pp. 84-87.

86. See: Briggs, Vernon, "Special Labor Market Segments," in Manpower Research and Labor Economics, (Editors: Gordon I. Swanson and Jon Michaelson), pp. 243-276.

87. The most comprehensive listing of economic establishments at the national level is that of the Census Brueau's Standard Statistical Establishment List (SSEL) used in developing employment data for County Business Patterns. This file of establishments is, however, not currently available to even other Federal agencies due to confidentiality requirements embodied in Federal legislation.

See: Coleman, Edwin J. and Goodman, Jeanne S., "Comments on the Wolfbein Report." Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 81-84.

87b. See: Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development and Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Job Development Resource Guides for the Employment and Training System, Boston, 1980.

88. Descriptions of the purposes and nature of the OES survey can be found in the following publications:

See:

i) Goldstein, Harold, "The New Federal-State Occupational Employment Statistics Program," Monthly Labor Review, October 1971, pp. 12-17;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976, pp. 56-59.

89. For a more detailed discussion of the use of Census data in constructing industry-occupation matrices,

See:

i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Tomorrow's Manpower Needs, Vol: IV, (Revised), Bulletin 1737, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971;

ii) Rowan, Ruth, Meeting State and Area Occupational Information Needs: The Industry-Occupation Matrix System, A report prepared for the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, 1976.

90. For a detailed review of the variables for which data were collected from households in the 5 percent and 15 percent samples,

See: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Public Use Samples of Basic Records from the 1970 Census: Description and Technical Documentation, Washington, D.C., 1972.

91. Differences in the contents of these two questionnaires can be reviewed in the document cited in footnote 90 above.

92. The 1980 census will not be based upon two samples of 5 percent and 15 percent. Rather, a single long-form questionnaire will be mailed to approximately 16 percent of all households in the nation, with oversampling in units

273

of local government with small populations (under 2,500).

See: Herriot, Roger A., "The 1980 Census: Countdown for a Complete Count," Monthly Labor Review, September 1979, pp. 3-13.

93. See: i) U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 59-61;

ii) Rowan, Ruth, Op. cit.

94. For example, file clerks may classify themselves as secretaries in providing a response to the household survey. In addition, census clerks may erroneously classify a given response.

See: i) Sum, Andrew M. and Ewer, David, "A Comparative Analysis of Selected Occupational Staffing Pattern Data from the 1970 Census and the OES Surveys in Massachusetts," unpublished Working Paper, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, 1977;

ii) U.S. Bureau of the Census, Evaluation and Research Program of the U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing 1960: The Employer Record Check, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963;

iii) Swerdloff, Sol, "Comments on the Paper by Harold Wool," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 571-75.

95. See: i) Scoville, James G., Manpower and Occupational Analysis: Concepts and Measurement, D.C. Heath & Co., Lexington, Mass., 1972;

ii) Scoville, James G., "Comments on the Harold Wool Paper," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 568-70.

96. See: i) Scoville, James G., Manpower and....;

ii) Dunlop, John, "Job Vacancies and Economic Analysis," Op. cit.

97. See: Goldstein, Harold, "The New Federal-State Occupational Employment Statistics Program" Monthly Labor Review, October, 1971, pp. 12-17.

98. The Bureau of Labor Statistics currently operates a small balance of nation survey designed to represent those states not currently cooperating in the OES program. Its purpose is to assist in producing national estimates of occupational staffing patterns by industry.

99. In some instances, industry/occupational listings are developed for greater levels of industrial detail; e.g., 3-digit SIC's.

100. For example, the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security has recently published estimates of employment by occupation in the state based upon a hybrid OES-Census matrix. No industrial detail were included within the report. The publication included a statement that "If additional information

on details concerning employment by occupation within Massachusetts' industries is sought, the unpublished tabulations are available for reference in the Occupation and Industry section of the Division of Employment Security."

See: Meisner, Charlotte and Rico, Susan, Variety and Distribution of Occupations in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, March, 1980.

101. It is generally assumed that staffing patterns do not change substantially over the three-year cycle. Within selected industry groups, particularly rapidly growing industries, however, staffing patterns may change more rapidly.

See: Goldstein, Harold, "The New Federal-State Occupational Employment Statistics Program," Op. cit.

102. Ibid., p. 15.

103. Mangum, Garth, Employment and Unemployment Statistics and the CETA Prime Sponsor, Background Paper No. 7, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., March, 1978, pp. 33-35.

104. Graf, Bruce, Proposed Methodologies for OES Survey Area Occupational/Employment Estimates, Draft report, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C. undated.

105. See:

i) Memorandum from Ronald E. Kutscher to All Regional Commissioners, Confidentiality of OES Survey Matrix Data, Bureau of Labor Statistics, February 15, 1980;

ii) Memorandum from Russell B. Flanders to SOICC Directors, Confidentiality of Data, National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, February 14, 1980.

106. Memorandum from Region I BLS Commissioner Wendell D. MacDonald to New England State Employment Security Agencies, OES Survey Publication Criteria, December 6, 1977.

107. For a description of the Labor Turnover Survey,

See:

i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 43-48;

ii) U.S. Employment Service, U.S. Department of Labor, ESP: Proceedings of the Employment Service Potential Meeting, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, the University of Michigan - Wayne State University, 1979.

108. For a general description of the ESP project and a review of the potential use of ESP data,

See: Cohen, Malcolm S., "ESP: A New Source of Labor Market Information," Paper Prepared for the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Ann Arbor, October 1978.

109. See:
    i) State of California, Employment Development Department, Employment Data and Research, Employment Service Potential: Volume I, The Dimensions of Labor Turnover, Sacramento, 1979;
    ii) Keith, Kenneth, "The Employment Service Potential Project: Fiscal Years 1977-79 and Beyond," in ESP: Proceedings of the Employment Service Potential Meetings, pp. 17-28.

110. California, New Mexico, and West Virginia do not currently cooperate in the LTS program. A small balance of nation sample is administered in these states to produce national estimates of labor turnover.

111. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 43-48.

112. See:
    i) Hall, Robert E. and Lillien, David M., "The Measurement and Significance of Labor Turnover" in Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 577-592;
    ii) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, p. 118.
    iii) Cohen, Malcolm S. and Schwartz, Arthur R., "Estimates of State New Hire Rates," in Proceedings of the Employment Service Potential Conference, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan - Wayne State University, Ann Arbor, 1978, pp. 5-38.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has recently been involved in efforts to improve the accuracy of the estimates produced by the LTS program.

See: Utter, Carol, "Improvements in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Labor Turnover Survey," ESP Proceedings of the Employment Service Potential Meeting, pp. 209-217.

113. For example, in 1947 the mining and manufacturing sectors of the U.S. economy accounted for 37.6 percent of total nonagricultural wage and salary employment in the nation. By 1977, these two sectors only represented 24.8 percent of the total number of nonagricultural wage and salary employees of the nation.

See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1978, "Table C-1," p. 262, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

114. For a more detailed description of the pilot tests,

See: i) Utter, Carol, Op. cit.;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Occupational Outlook, 1979 Job Vacancy - Labor Turnover Pilot Studies, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C. Unpublished, August, 1978.

115. To date, only one study pertaining to the labor turnover component of the JOS Pilot Project has been produced. This study recommended against combining job openings and labor turnover data collection efforts.

See: Dooley, Patricia and Harrington, Paul, Expansion of the Labor Turnover Survey Sample Under the Massachusetts Job Openings Pilot Survey Project, Massachusetts Pilot Job Openings Survey, Research Paper Number Six, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, August, 1979.

116. See: Hall, Robert E. and Lillien, David M., Op. cit.., p. 585.

117. For a more detailed description of the pioneering efforts to develop an ESP methodology,

See: i) Nevada Employment Security Department, Progress Report: Employment Service Potential Project, Carson City, Nevada, June 15, 1976;

ii) Hardiman, Phil and Siebert, Glen, First Progress Report on the Employment Service Potential Project, Report to Region IX Employment and Training Administration, Sacramento, June 1976.

118. The 39 "wage record" states contain approximately 70 percent of total wages and salary employment throughout the nation.

See: Cohen, Malcolm S., "ESP: A New Source of Labor Market Information," p. 1.

119. Utah Department of Employment Security, Utilizing Occupational Hires Data, Salt Lake City, February 1977.

120. State of California, Employment Development Department, Employment Service Potential: Volume III, Special Survey of Employers, Report Prepared for Region IX Employment and Training Administration, Sacramento, September, 1979.

121. The U.I. wage records could potentially be used to track the mobility (industrial and earnings) of individual workers. Such data could be used to determine the types of establishments and industries that provide substantial earnings mobility opportunities for workers.

See: State of California, Employment Development Department, Employment Service Potential, Volume I: The Dimension of Labor Turnover, pp. 96-101.

122. For example, See:

i) Sum, Andrew, Issues Related to the Purposes, Collection, Analysis and Interpretation of Job Vacancy Statistics, Proceedings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Job Vacancy Statistics Conference, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., August, 1978;

ii) Solow, Robert, The Nature and Sources of Unemployment in the United States, Almquist, Stockholm, 1969;

iii) Holt, Charles C. and David, Martin H., "The Concept of Job Vacancies in a Dynamic Theory of the Labor Market," The Measurement and Interpretation of Job Vacancy Statistics, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1966;

iv) Marshall, Ray and Perlman, Richard (eds.), An Anthology of Labor Economics, New York, Wiley, 1972, p. 338.

v) Frumerman, Harry, Op. cit.

123. See: i) Sturniolo, Louis, Issues Related to the Collection and Utilization of Help-Wanted Advertising Information, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Policy and Evaluation Division, Boston, December, 1979;

ii) Johnson, Miriam; Sugarman, Marged; and Walsh, John; Help Wanted: Case Studies of Classified Ads, Olympus Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1975.

124. Preston, Noreen, The Help-Wanted Index: Technical Description and Behavioral Trends, The Conference Board, New York, 1977.

125. For example, See:

Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, A Monthly Survey of Unfilled Job Openings: Boston-Metro, Springfield, Worcester, Lawrence Taunton Job Banks - June 1977, Boston, 1977.

126. See: Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Occupational Opportunities Information for Wisconsin, Vol. 10, No. 1, Madison, June 1979.

127. This information appears in the microfiche files containing the job openings placed by employers; however, this information is typically not tabulated by the SESA's in the preparation of the publications on Job Bank's unfilled openings.

128. For example, it has been estimated that the Boston SMSA Job Bank included on average approximately 70 percent of the total number of job vacancies estimated by the JOLTS program in 1973.

See: Harrington, Paul and Sum, Andrew, *Unemployment in Massachusetts: A Critical Assessment of Its Nature and Causes*, pp. 66-67, 72-73.

129. Camil Associates, *Recruitment, Job Search, and the United States Employment Service*, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, R&D Monograph 43, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1976.

130. Previous efforts to compare the occupational characteristics of statewide job vacancies estimated by the Massachusetts JOLTS survey with those of unfilled job orders appearing on the state's Job Banks revealed that professional, technical, and managerial occupations were underrepresented on the Job Banks while service, processing, machine, and bench occupations were overrepresented.

See: Sum, Andrew, *Labor Market Information from a User's Perspective: Data Inputs for CETA Planning Purposes*, pp. 31-39.

131. For a description of the JOLTS survey and an analysis of a number of its findings,

132. *See*:

i) White, Sheila C., "Job Vacancy Survey," *Employment and Earnings*, Vol. 17, September, 1979, pp. 18-26;

ii) Armknecht, Paul A., "Job Vacancies in Manufacturing, 1969-73," *Monthly Labor Review*, August, 1974, pp. 27-33.

133. Memorandum to Paul Krueger, Office of Management and Budget, from Julius Shiskin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, December 7, 1973.

134. *See*:

i) Rosenthal, Neil; Harrington, Paul; Sommers, Dixie; and Terlizzi, Lois; *Issues Underlying the Development of Job Vacancy Statistics*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., August, 1977;

ii) Moore, Geoffrey H., *Improving the Presentation of Employment and Unemployment Statistics*, NCEUS Background Paper Number 22, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., August, 1978;

iii) "Bill Promotes Use of Job Vacancy Rate," *Employment and Training Reporter*, Volume 11, Number 28, March 26, 1980.

135. For a detailed description of the pilot JOS survey design,

See: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Job Openings Survey Manual*, Washington, D.C., February, 1979.

136. For a description of this research project,

See: Harrington, Paul and Sum, Andrew, *An Overview of the Pilot Job Openings Survey in Massachusetts*, Pilot Job Openings Survey, Research Report Number One, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development, Boston, September 1979.

137. See:

i) Bokan, Marianne and Harrington, Paul, "Preliminary Findings of the Pilot Job Openings Survey in Massachusetts" in Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy Planning, and Evaluation, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, March, 1980, pp. 339-392;

ii) Harrington, Paul and Stuniolo, Louis, Findings of the JOS Response Analysis Survey, Pilot Job Openings Survey Research Report Number Thirteen, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, September, 1979;

iii) Bokan, Marianne; Harrington, Paul; and Stuniolo, Louis; A Preliminary Report on Response and Non-Response in the First Round of the Massachusetts Job Openings Survey Pilot Project, Pilot Job Openings Survey Research Report Number Eight, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, September, 1979.

137b. See pages 105-107 of this report for a discussion of the role of such information in the planning and design of local CETA employment and training programs.

138. An example of such a statewide econometric forecasting model in the Massachusetts Economic Policy Analysis (MEPA) model.

See:

i) Treyz, George I., Predicting the Economic Effects of State Policy Initiatives, Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, undated;

ii) Treyz, George I., et al., An Overview of the Massachusetts Economic Policy Analysis (MEPA) Model and Its Use From 1977 through 1980, Paper presented for an assessment of the State of the Art in Regional Modeling, Cambridge, April 1980.

139. The Employment and Training Administration has funded a research project designed to produce sub-state projections of both supply and demand over a two-year timeframe.

See: Kassander, A. Richard and Taylor, Carol, Technical Proposal in Response to RFP ETA/OPER 7602-4: A Local Labor Market Econometric Forecasting Model, University of Arizona, May 14, 1976.

The findings of this study and subsequent reassessments of local econometric models seem to cast some doubt on the ability to cheaply develop econometric-based employment projections models for substate areas that are superior to the existing BLS/SESA industry employment projections model.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, *Employment and Training Evaluation Report-1979*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1979, p. 22.

140. The short-term industry employment projections produced by state econometric models could be used to produce short-term projections of employment by occupation. To do so, however, existing statewide industry/occupation matrices would have to be substantially collapsed to produce industry/occupation coefficients for the more limited number of industry sectors (26) for which short-term employment projections are made. In addition, one would have to assume that occupational employment in an industry would expand or contract at a rate equivalent to that of the entire industry in which it was located. During economic declines, layoffs of workers in different occupations do *not* typically occur at uniform rates, but rather are concentrated among occupations characterized by relatively low amounts of specific training.

    See: Oi, Walter Y., "Labor as a Quasi-fixed Factor," *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. LXX, No. 6, Dec. 1962, pp. 538-555.

141. The Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor has recently funded a study by Columbia University to determine the utility for employment and training program planning of econometric models for local economies.

    See: U.S. Department of Labor, *Employment and Training Evaluation Report-1979*, p. 22.

142. *See*: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *BLS Handbook of Methods*, Bulletin 1910, p. 61;

    ii) Rowan, Ruth, *Op. cit.*

143. A linear least squares regression of state industry employment against national industry employment, and time is usually employed by cooperating SESA's. While the BLS regression method has been critiqued by a number of researchers, its results have been found to compare favorably to more sophisticated projection techniques, including industry employment projections from state econometric models.

    See: i) Hudson-Wilson, Susan and Wheeler, David, *State Employment Forecasts: An Evaluation of the BLS System*, Boston University, Boston, 1977.

    ii) Fishkind, Henry and Roberts, R. Blaine, "Two Methods of Projecting Occupational Employment," *Monthly Labor Review*, May, 1978.

144. Memorandum from John W. Gracza to State Employment Security Agencies and Regional Commissioners, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Background Material for the OES Matrix/Projection Program*, January 31, 1977.

145. While the BLS has provided SESA staff with a guide for examining industry employment projections, no specific criteria exist with respect to what constitutes a "reasonable" projection.

See: Memorandum from John W. Gracza to State Employment Security Administrators, and Regional Commissioners, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *State and Area Projections Program: Economic Base Analysis*, May 30, 1978.

146. These change factors are derived from the BLS National Matrix program. For a more detailed discussion of this issue,

See: Rowan, Ruth, *Op. cit*.

147. For a more detailed discussion of the methodologies employed in estimating separation rates for occupations,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Tomorrow's Manpower Needs: Supplement Number Four*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.

148. It is not known to what extent labor force separation rates due to death, retirement, disability and family responsibilities vary among age/sex groups by occupation or among states and ages. If substantial variation does exist then the potential exists for relatively large errors to occur in the estimates of annual average job openings within various states and areas.

149. *See*: Dempsey, Richard, "The Bureau of Labor Statistics Employment Projections Program" in *Occupational Employment Projections for Program Planning Purposes: Issues and Examples*, David W. Stevens (ed.), Human Resources Research Program, University of Missouri-Columbia, January, 1976.

For a review of findings on the extent of occupational mobility of American workers based on 1970 Census data and a description of current BLS efforts to improve our knowledge of occupational mobility,

See: i) Sommers, Dixie and Eck, Alan, "Occupational Mobility in the American Labor Force," *Monthly Labor Review*, July 1977, pp. 18-24.

ii) Eck, Alan et al., *Measuring Labor Force Movements: A New Approach*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Report 581, Washington, D.C., 1980.

150. For example, the Bureau of Labor Statistics published labor force separation rates in 1974 as part of its *Tomorrow's Manpower Needs* projections program. These data have recently been revised by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

See: Sommers, Dixie and Cohen, Carin, "New Occupational Rates of Labor Force Separation" in *Monthly Labor Review*, March, 1980 pp. 36-40.

151. The separation rate is actually multiplied by interpolated employment in the occupation between the base and target year of the projection period; e.g., 1976 and 1985 for Massachusetts.

152. For a more detailed discussion of this particular problem,

See: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, *Employment Requirements by Occupation, by Industry 1976-1985*, Boston, 1979, pp. 51-52.

153. *See*: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Projections and Training Data*, Bulletin 2020, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, p. 6.

154. This will require updates of both mortality rates for age-sex groups throughout the American population and labor force participation rates for age-sex groups. For a review of recent BLS labor force projections to 1990,

See: Flaim, Paul O. and Fullerton, Howard, N., "Labor Force Projections to 1990: Three Possible Paths," *Employment Projections for the 1980's* BLS Bulletin 2030, pp. 1-11.

155. *See*: Sum, Andrew M., "Women in the Labor Force: Why Projections Have Been Too Low," *Monthly Labor Review*, July 1977, pp. 18-25.

156. *See*:
   i) Personick, Valerie A. and Sylvester, Robert A., "Evaluation of BLS 1970 Economic and Employment Projections," *Monthly Labor Review*, August, 1976, pp. 13-26;
   ii) Christy, P. T. and Horowitz, K. J., "Evaluation of BLS Projections of 1975 Output and Employment," *Monthly Labor Review*, August, 1979, pp. 8-19.

157. The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics has recently recommended that a systematic review be undertaken of the national, state and area employment projections program to determine the degree of their accuracy and sources of errors in projections to improve the future operations of the projections program. The Secretary of Labor has agreed to implement this recommendation although no details on the nature of this undertaking have been provided.

See:
   i) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, *Counting the Labor Force*, p. 109;
   ii) U.S. Department of Labor, *Interim Report of the Secretary of Labor on the Recommendations of the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics*, pp. 17-18.

158. For a more detailed discussion of this issue and the findings of an employer-based survey on the sources of labor supply to a selected number of high net demand occupations in the Boston SMSA,

See: Mazzeo, Katherine and Sum, Andrew, An Analysis of the Sources of Labor Supply and Labor Recruitment Methods of Firms Employing Workers in Fifteen High Net Demand Occupations in the Boston Metropolitan Area, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

159. For a review of the procedures used by the BLS in conducting these occupational wage surveys,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 135-145.

A recent analysis of variations in the wages of workers in selected occupations based upon the findings of the BLS occupational wage surveys for local labor areas throughout the nation can be found in the following publication:

Buckley, John E., "Do Area Wages Reflect Area Living Costs?", Monthly Labor Review, September, 1979, pp. 24-29.

160. See:

i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 135-136;

ii) "Occupational Earnings in Auto Dealers Repair Shops," Monthly Labor Review, April, 1980, p. 56;

iii) Rieg, Mary K., "Pay Factors Displayed in Dress Manufacturing," April, 1979, pp. 54-56;

iv) Schwenk, Albert E. and Personick, Martin E., "Analyzing Earnings Differentials in Industry Wage Surveys," Monthly Labor Review, June, 1974, pp. 56-59.

161. See:

i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 136-137;

ii) Stelluto, George L., "Federal Pay Comparability: Facts to Temper the Debate," Monthly Labor Review, June, 1979, pp. 18-28.

162. See:

i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, p. 137;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Directory of Occupational Wage Surveys: January 1970-December 1977, Report 537, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

163. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910.

164. See:

i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, BLS Handbook of Methods, Bulletin 1910, pp. 26-42;

ii) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 165-168;

iii) Wolfbein, Seymour, Op. cit.

Generally one digit SIC industry detail are available at the state and local level except for manufacturing industries for which selected two digit SIC industry earnings and hours estimates are produced.

See: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Employment Review, October, 1979, p. 3.

165. Such data, however, may only be available in an unpublished form. For a discussion of the data produced under the CES program,

See: Harrison, Bennett; Kelley, Maryellen; Skilnyk, Anastasia; and Sum, Andrew; A Manual for CETA Prime Sponsors on the Monitoring and Evaluation of Title One Program for Employment and Training, Second Edition, National Civil Service League, Washington, D.C. December, 1976.

166. The SESA's often produce monthly or quarterly reports containing information on the wage distributions of unfilled job openings on Job Banks by occupation.

See:

i) Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, A Monthly Survey of Unfilled Job Openings: Job Banks - June 1977, Boston, 1977;

ii) Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations, Occupational Opportunities Information for Wisconsin, Madison, June, 1979;

iii) State of Vermont, Department of Employment Security, Quarterly Report of Job Openings Received by Occupation and Wage Rate in Vermont's Twelve Labor Market Areas, Montpelier, 1979.

167. For examples of wage surveys of this type,

See:

i) Maine Department of Manpower Affairs, Manpower Research Division, 1978 Maine Occupational Wages in Manufacturing Industries, Augusta, 1979;

ii) Virginia Employment Commission, Manpower Research Division, 1976 Wage Rates and Fringe Benefits for Selected Occupations Paid by Virginia Manufacturers, Richmond, 1976.

For an example of a business association sponsored wage survey,

See: Chamber of Commerce of the Greater Portland Region, Wage and Salary Survey 1979, Personnel Management Association, Chamber of Commerce of the Greater Portland Region, 1979.

168. For a more detailed discussion of the nature of internal labor markets in various industries and the usefulness of such information in developing appropriate manpower policies,

See: Doeringer, Peter B. and Piore, Michael J., Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis.

169. For a review of the concept and nature of ports of entry,

See: Kerr, Clark, "The Balkanization of Labor Markets," Readings in Labor Economics and Labor Relations (2nd Edition), (Edited by Lloyd J. Reynolds, et al.), pp. 62-77.

170. While no on-going statistical program designed to produce information on internal labor markets exist, some states have made individual efforts to develop such an understanding,

See: i) South Carolina Employment Security Commission, Job Guide for Entry Occupations in South Carolina, Columbia, 1979;

ii) Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; and Herrnstadt, Irwin; Issues in the Development....

171. Marshall, Ray, "Implications of Labor Market Theory for Employment Policy," in Manpower Research and Labor Economics (Editors: Swanson and Michaelson) Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1979, p. 40.

172. Ibid...The need for more comprehensive information on internal labor markets has also been noted by other analysts.

See: Barth, Peter, "Labor Market Operations: A Review of Research," in Manpower Research and Labor Markets, pp. 179-241.

173. See: Doeringer, Peter B. and Piore, Michael J., Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis, D.C. Heath, Lexington, 1971.

A number of studies of manpower utilization in the health and construction industries have also been conducted. Among such studies are the following:

i) Dunlop, John T. and Mills, Daniel Q., Manpower Development and Utilization in the Contract Construction Industry, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1971;

ii) Goldstein, Harold M. and Horowitz, Morris A., Entry-Level Health Occupations: Development and Future, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1977.

A detailed review of existing literature on labor market operations, including the internal labor markets of various industries, can be found in the following article: Barth, Peter, Op. cit.

174. A recent study of employer hiring practices in the Boston SMSA provided some information on the internal labor markets of firms hiring workers in fifteen high net demand occupations,

See: Mazzeo, Katherine and Sum, Andrew, An Analysis of On-the-Job Training, Promotion Opportunities, and Job Vacancies in the Fifteen High Net Demand Occupations, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

175. See: Shea, John R., "Occupational Education and Training Requirements: Relationships Essential for Planning State Vocational Education," in Manpower Information for Vocational Education Planning, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1969.

176. See: Freedman, Marcia and Dutka, Anna, Training Information for Policy Guidance, Employment and Training Administration, R&D Monograph 76, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1980.

177. See:

i) Sum, Andrew M.; Sawhney, P.K.; and Herrnstadt, Irwin, Issues in the Development of a Comprehensive Occupational Information System for Planning Employment and Training Programs at the State and Local Level: Current Research Efforts Within the State of Massachusetts, Paper Presented at the Fifth Annual New England Business and Economic Development Conference, Wakefield, Massachusetts, November, 1977, particularly pp. 44-72;

ii) Mazzeo, Katherine and Sum, Andrew, An Analysis of Hiring Standards and Wage Policies of Firms Employing Workers in Fifteen High Net Demand Occupations in the Boston Metropolitan Area, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978;

iii) New York Department of Labor, Division of Research and Statistics, Technical and Manpower in New York State, 2 Volumes, Albany, 1964;

iv) Soloman, H., Manpower Needs in Health Services, New York State Department of Labor, Albany, 1969;

v) Horowitz, Morris and Herrnstadt, Irwin, The Training of Tool and Die Makers, Northeastern University, Boston, 1968;

vi) Goldstein, Harold M. and Horowitz, Morris A., Utilization of Health Personnel: A Five Hospital Study, Aspen Systems Corporation, Germantown, Maryland, 1978;

vii) Freedman, Marcia and Dutka, Anna, Op. cit.;

viii) Marshall, Ray; Glover, Robert W., and Franklin, William, S., Training and Entry into Union Construction, Manpower R&D Monograph 39, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975;

ix) National Commission for Manpower Policy Staff Report, "Corporate Hiring Practices," in From School to Work: Improving the Transition, pp. 37-55.

178. See: Harrington, Paul and McLaughlin, Francis, The Planning, Design and Implementation of the STIP I Program: The Experience of the Massachusetts Balance of State Prime Sponsor, Research Report Prepared for the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, 1980.

A major effort was undertaken in 1978 by the city of New York prime sponsor to develop an understanding of firms' hiring policies and practices within selected industrial and occupation segments of the New York City economy,

See: Lynton, Edith F.; Seldin, Joel R.; and Gruhin, Sarah, Employer's Views on Hiring and Training: A Non-Statistical Approach to Data-Gathering, Labor Market Information Network, New York, 1978.

179. For a review of the diverse nature of these undertakings in the New England region,

See: Sum, Andrew; Harrington, Paul; Herrnstadt, Irwin; and Meehan, Edward; CETA Program Planning and Private Sector Employment and Training Needs: Proceedings of Two Conferences on Title VII Planning, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University and Massachusetts State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, Boston.

180. Ideally, CETA prime sponsor planners would also have access to data and information sources on structured OJT programs and in-house training programs of private sector firms and public agencies. Knowledege of the magnitude and nature of these programs and their role in meeting the manpower needs of employers would be useful in pdetermining the type and degree of training to provide to CETA participants. The national office of BLS has engaged in several pilot efforts to determine the feasibility of collecting data on in-house training programs of private sector employers.

See: i) Neary, H. James, "The BLS Pilot Survey of Training in Industry," Monthly Labor Review, February, 1974, pp. 26-32;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics and Employment and Training Administration, Occupational Training in Selected Metalworking Industries: A Report on a Survey of Selected Occupations, 1974, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

181. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment: States, 1978 and Metropolitan Areas, 1977-78, Report 571, pp. 22-25, 47-49, 70-72.

182. For central cities, unemployment data are provided for only the following three Census occupational categories: White collar workers, blue collar workers and service workers.

See: Ibid., p. 49.

183. For example, the annual average data for calendar year 1978 for states and SMSA's were published in September, 1979. The 1977 annual average data for large SMSA's and central cities were not published until September, 1979.

184. A comparative analysis of the occupational unemployment data for large states is presented in the following publication: Ganz, Russell, The Structure of Unemployment Rates by Major Occupational Category for the United States, Massachusetts, and the Other Ten Largest States, 1976 and 1977, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

185. For example,

See:
- i) Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Occupational Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed in Massachusetts July-December 1978, Boston, 1979;
- ii) State of Vermont, Department of Employment Security, Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed: Vermont and Its Labor Market Areas, Montpelier, March, 1980;
- iii) Maine Department of Manpower Affairs, Manpower Research Division, Fiscal 1979 Annual Planning Information: Kennebec County, Augusta, 1978.

186. For example, the occupational characteristics of the insured unemployed in Massachusetts for each month during the July-December, 1978 period were published in one combined report in the winter of 1979. The occupational data provided for claimants at the state level are typically more detailed than those for local labor areas (3-digit DOT versus 1-digit DOT codes).

187. The National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics has recommended that "pilot studies (be undertaken) by one or more state employment security agencies to determine the feasibility and costs of developing reliable estimates of occupational unemployment rates at the state and local level.."

See: National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, p. 111.

188. For examples of such reports and their potential uses in planning local CETA programs,

See: i) Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Selected Characteristics of U.I. Claimants, December-January 1978, by Prime Sponsor and Subgrantee Area, Boston, June 1978;

ii) Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; Meehan, Edward; Tortora, Frank; and Harrington, Charles; Sources and Uses of Local Labor Market Information...., pp. 19-31.

189. To increase the usefulness of further disaggregation of the U.I. claimants data, the sample size of the ES-203 survey would have to be substantially expanded. Surveying the universe of claims would be most desirable for increasing the utility of the occupational and industrial data for local program planning purposes.

190. See: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Characteristics of Applicants Registered in Employment Service Offices and Selected Employment Service Activities, Massachusetts, Boston, 1979.

191. The use of the Job Service by unemployed jobseekers tends to vary by sex, race, and age as well. Among unemployed jobseekers, men tend to rely on the Job Service more than women, blacks and other minorities more than whites, and adults (20+) more than teenagers.

See: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, pp. 276-278.

192. For a more detailed description of such procedures and of alternative methods for utilizing ESARS data in the local CETA prime sponsor planning process,

See: i) Ganz, Russell, Applications of the Employment Security Automated Reporting System (ESARS) for Targetting CETA Resources at the Local Level;

ii) Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; Meehan, Edward; Tortora, Frank; and Harrington, Charles; Sources and Uses of Local Labor Market Information..., pp. 31-44.

193. For a more detailed discussion of the nature of these reporting systems,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Projections and Training Data, Bulletin 2020, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Training Information in New England: An Evaluation, Boston, 1978;

iii) LeCam, Christine, "The Role of Institutional Supply Data in the Development of an Occupational Information System," in Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning, and Evaluation, pp. 283-338.

194. See: National Center for Educational Statistics, The VEDS Forms Handbook, Washington, D.C., 1979.

195. The system used by the Office of Education in classifying vocational education programs has recently been modified by that agency.

196. For a review of the O.E. reporting system prior to VEDS,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Training Information in New England...,

ii) Kazarian, Robert; Sum, Andrew; and Sawhney, P.K.; Data Sources on Enrollments in and Completions from Public Vocational Education Programs in the Boston Metropolitan Area, a Report Prepared for the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Industry/Occupation Research Department, Boston, 1977;

iii) LeCam, Christine, Op. cit.

197. Only 100+ individual O.E. programs are identified on the enrollment forms.

198. For a review of the types of data on enrollments and completions available from the Massachusetts Office of Private Schools,

See: Vinson, Robert; Sum, Andrew; and Sawhney, P.K., Available Data Sources on Enrollment, Completions, and Placements from Vocational Training Programs in Proprietary Schools Licensed by the Massachusetts Department of Education, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, 1977.

199. For further details on the nature of this survey and previous such surveys by NCES,

See: i) LeCam, Christine, Op. cit.;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Projections and Training Data, Bulletin 2020, pp. 10-12.

200. For more details on the nature and limitations of the data produced by this survey,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Training Information in New England...;

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Projections and Training Data, Bulletin 2020, pp. 15-17;

iii) LeCam, Christine, Op. cit., pp. 309-311.

201. The HEGIS program classification system has recently been modified to make it more comparable to other occupational program classification systems, such as the U.S. O.E. system.

See: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, A Classification of Instructional Systems, Prepared for the National Center for Educational Statistics, Boulder, 1980.

202. See: National Center for Educational Statistics, Earned Degrees Conferred: 1973-74, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

203. The maximum limits (104 weeks over five years) on payments of stipends to individuals participating in classroom training activities may well sharply curtail individual referrals to associate degree programs.

See: 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524, "Sec.121(c)(1)."

204. For further details on the features of this reporting system,

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Training Information in New England: An Evaluation;

ii) LeCam, Christine, Op. cit., pp. 314-136.

204a. For a review of the issues involved in conducting comprehensive occupational supply/demand matching,

See: i) Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; and Herrnstadt, Irwin; Issues in the Development of a Comprehensive Occupational Information System...;

ii) LeCam, Christine and Sum, Andrew, A Description of the Methodology and Data Sources...;

iii) Tarr, James R. and Campbell, Timothy A., Op. cit.

205. For examples of such studies,

See: i) Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; and Mazzeo, Katherine; An Introduction to the Role of Occupational Information Systems; the Objectives of the Labor Supply Study, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978;

ii) Freedman, Marcia and Dutka, Anna, Op. cit.

206. For a more detailed discussion of the structure of these reporting forms and the procedures used in preparing them,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook.

207. A brief overview of the outcomes of CETA programs for the nation as a whole based upon the data contained in the Program Status Summaries can be found in the following publication: U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979, pp. 35-36, 364.

208. For further details on the structure of this reporting form,

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Forms Preparation Handbook.

209. For a more detailed overview of the purposes and design of the survey,

See:
- i) Westat, Inc., Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey: Technical Report No. 1, Methodology, Rockville, Md., 1977;
- ii) O'Keefe, Patrick, "Program Information Systems," in CETA: An Analysis of the Issues, pp. 185-215.

210. The first round of CLMS interviews occurred in 1975. The annual number of initial interviews was intended to be approximately 15,000, however, the sample size has grown over the past few years to include participants in new employment and training initiatives, such as the PSE stimulus of 1977, the YEDPA youth-oriented programs, and the Skills Training Improvement Program (STIP).

211. Among the reports produced thus far on the characteristics of CETA participants and their labor force and earnings experiences during the follow-up period are the following:

- i) Westat, Inc., CLMS Report No. 8: Characteristics of Enrollees Who Entered CETA Programs During Fiscal Year 1977, Prepared for U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Rockville, 1978;
- ii) Westat, Inc., Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey, Follow-Up Report No. 1 (18 Months After Entry), Post-Program Experience and Pre-Post Comparisons for Terminees Who Entered CETA in January-June 1975, Prepared for U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Rockville, 1978.

212. See: Brandwein, Seymour, Op. cit.

213. For a similar view on this issue,

See: O'Keefe, Patrick, *Op. cit.*

214. For a brief historical overview of the development of the CETA follow-up system in New England,

See Sum, Andrew, *Follow-Up Evaluation Efforts of New England Prime Sponsors*, Paper prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor Conference on CETA Title II Performance Indicators, Alexandria, Va., February, 1980.

215. Copies of the questionnaires used in conducting the follow-up interviews with terminees from CETA Title II adult-oriented programs can be found in the following publication: Goldberg, Steve; Schneider, Glen; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; *Data Collection Materials for Follow-up Evaluations of Title IIB Adult Programs*, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, Janaury, 1979.

216. *See*: 95th U.S. Congress, *Public Law 95-524*.

Chapter 5

Recommendations for Improving the Labor Force and Occupational Information Available to Local CETA Prime Sponsors for Policymaking and Program Planning Purposes

Introduction

The third chapter of this report was devoted to a discussion of the specific types of labor force and occupational information that are needed by CETA prime sponsors for local policymaking, program planning, and program operations purposes. The fourth chapter provided a detailed review of existing data sources on labor force and occupational information that could be used at least in part to meet the above policymaking and planning needs of CETA prime sponsors. In that chapter, the geographic coverage, frequency of availability, and primary characteristics of each available data source were described and were accompanied by a review of the limitations of each such source for local CETA policymaking and program planning purposes. This chapter is primarily designed to provide a series of recommendations for improving the availability and usefulness of local labor force and occupational information to CETA prime sponsors for policymaking and program planning.

The recommendations presented in this concluding chapter are organized along lines similar to those that were followed in preparing chapters 3 and 4. Recommendations for improving data on the local population, resident labor force, earnings and incomes of local residents, and the local economically disadvantaged population are summarized in table 5-1. Recommendations for improving the availability of data on local industry and occupational employment and information on the characteristics of individual occupations are presented in table 5-2. Tables 5-3A and 5-3B provide recommendations for improving the availability of information on local occupational supply, including the occupational characteristics of the local unemployed population; the numbers, types, and features of local occupationally-oriented classroom training ad apprenticeship programs; and the actual sources of labor supply utilized by local employers for meeting their manpower needs in selected

Table 5-1. Recommendations for Improving Population, Labor Force, Earnings, and Incomes Information for Local CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
Local Population Data	. Provide detailed demographic profiles of the population within prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas based upon the 1980 Census.
	. Develop public use tapes for the 1980 Census data containing geographic identifiers for prime sponsor and subgrantee areas.
	. Examine the accuracy of the prime sponsor population projections based upon the LMPM Model.
	. Refine the LMPM Model for use in providing prime sponsor population injections between national censuses.
Local Labor Force Dat	. Provide detailed demographic and socioeconomic profiles of labor force participants in prime sponsor and subgrantee areas based upon 1980 Census data, including estimates of the labor force participation rates of each of these groups.
	. Produce more detailed annual average data on the demographic characteristics of labor force participants in states, major SMSA's and balance of states based upon the expanded CPS household survey.
	. Utilize more state specific CPS-based data on annual changes in the labor force participation rates of demographic groups for use in the LMPM labor force projections model.
Local Employment Data	. Provide detailed demographic and socioeconomic profiles of the employed population in prime sponsor and subgrantee areas based upon the 1980 Census, including estimates of employment/population ratios for each of these groups.

Table 5-1. (continued)

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
Local Employment Data (cont.)	. Provide demographic and selected socioeconomic profiles of the employed population by occupation and industry within prime sponsor planning areas based upon the 1980 Census.
	. Utilize more state specific CPS-based data on annual changes in the employment/population ratios of demographic groups for use in the LMPM projections model.
Local Unemployment Data	. Provide detailed demographic and socioeconomic profiles of the unemployed in prime sponsor and subgrantee areas based upon the 1980 Census, including estimates of unemployment rates for each of these groups.
	. Provide more detailed estimates of the annual average unemployment rates of persons in various demographic groups in states, major SMSA's, and balance of states based upon the expanded CPS household survey.
	. Utilize more state specific CPS-based data on annual changes in unemployment rates of selected demographic groups for use in the LMPM unemployment projections model..
	. Modify the existing ES-203 survey to enable it to provide more geographically disaggregated monthly data on the demographic, occupational, and industrial characteristics of all U.I. claimants and monthly estimates of the numbers and characteristics of U.I. exhaustees.
	. Encourage SESA's and prime sponsors to conduct on-going surveys of U.I. claimants to obtain information on their job search behavior, barriers to employment, CETA eligibility, knowledge of available CETA resources, and uses of CETA resources.

Table 5-1. (continued)

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
Earnings and Incomes Data	. Produce detailed estimates of the annual earnings of persons in various demographic and socioeconomic groups within CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas based upon the 1980 Census data.
	. Produce detailed estimates of the annual earnings, both total and by weeks worked, of persons by occupation and industry for states, labor areas, and CETA prime sponsor planning areas based upon the 1980 Census.
	. Produce detailed estimates of the annual incomes and sources of incomes of households and families within CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas; provide profiles of family incomes by the demographic and selected socioeconomic characteristics of the family's primary earner and by the number of earners per family.
	. Provide estimates of the annual household and family incomes of selected subgroups of households and families for states and major SMSA's based upon the expanded CPS household survey.
Numbers and Characteristics of the Local Economically Disadvantaged Population	. Provide detailed estimates of the number of economically disadvantaged households, families, and persons within prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas based upon the 1980 Census.
	. Provide detailed profiles of the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of disadvantaged households and families within prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas based upon the 1980 Census data.

Table 5-1. (continued)

Types of Data or Information	Recommendations
Number and Characteristics of the Local Economically Disadvantaged Population	. Provide detailed profiles of the work experiences, occupational and industrial attachments, and earnings of the primary earners in economically disadvantaged households and families within prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas based upon the 1980 Census data. . Provide annual average estimates of the number of economically disadvantaged households and families in states and major SMSA's based upon the expanded CPS household survey (Annual Demographic File). . Have the U.S. Department of Labor consider the funding of an expanded CPS type survey in March 1983 to provide more current estimates of the numbers and characteristics of economically disadvantaged households, families, and persons in prime sponsor planning areas. . Modify the ESARS system to enable it to produce quarterly reports on the numbers and characteristics of economically disadvantaged active applicants within prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas; provide more detailed information on the services provided to economically disadvantaged applicants, particularly placements into unsubsidized jobs and CETA-related employment and training programs.

Table 5-2. Recommendations for Improving Information on Local Industrial and Occupational Employment Developments and Occupational Characteristics for CETA Prime Sponsor Policymaking and Program Planning

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
Industry Employment Data	. Provide more detailed information on current and historical trends in non-agricultural wage and salary employment by industry within states and local labor areas based upon the Current Employment Statistics Program (CES).
	. Expand the CES survey in nonmanufacturing sectors to provide more industry detail on wage and salary employment in states and major local labor areas.
	. Utilize the industry employment data produced by the ES-202 system to provide information on the current levels and trends in the levels of covered employment within detailed industries (3-digit SIC codes) in states and local labor areas.
Employer Directories	. Utilize the establishment listing of the ES-202 system within states to produce employer directories for use in developing OJT contracts and placing terminees from other CETA employment and training programs.
Occupational Staffing Pattern Data	. Employ an occupational classification system capable of yielding historically comparable data on employment within detailed occupations.
	. Substantially reduce the number of active occupational titles employed in the OES survey system.
	. Consider adoption of the SOC system for use in the OES classification system.
	. Develop methods for generating estimates of employment by detailed occupation at the local labor area level.

Table 5-2. (continued)

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
Labor Turnover and Accessions	. Provide detailed, firm-specific data on accession rates from the ESP program to CETA job development and placement staff.
	. Expand the BLS-SESA Labor Turnover Survey into all nonmanufacturing industries.
	. Undertake a cooperative BLS-SESA program designed to produce estimates of new hires by industry and detailed occupation for states and major labor areas.
Job Openings Data	. Expand publications of job bank job openings data to include narratives outlining trends in industry employment and job openings by industry and occupation.
	Undertake a cooperative BLS-SESA program to produce estimates of job openings by industry and detailed occupation for states and major labor areas.
Projections of Employment by Have the Employment and Training at the State and Sub-State Level	. Have the Employment and Training Administration develop standardized techniques for use by local prime sponsor staff in obtaining short-term employment and hiring forecasts from employers for specific industry/occupation job clusters.
	. Update employment projections at the state and major labor area level every two to three years.
	. Update separation rates for occupations more frequently and revise projections of annual average job openings due to replacement demand.

Table 5-2. (continued)

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
	. With the cooperation of NOICC, the SOICC network, and SESA's, BLS should devise an on-going evaluation system for the projections program.
	. Through the use of local employer surveys, assess the nature of internal and external job openings for specific occupations.
Wages and Hours of Work; Structure of Internal Labor Markets; and Establishment Hiring Policies and Patterns	. Develop information on internal labor markets through specialized employer surveys conducted at the local level.
	. NOICC and SOICC's should attempt to coordinate such local data collection efforts by: i) identifying existing sources of labor market and occupational information for users; ii) facilitating prime sponsor access to such information; iii) attempting to standardize methods and concepts employed in conducting local surveys.

Table 5-3A. Recommendations for Improving Information on Unemployment Developments within Occupations

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
Number of Unemployed Workers and Unemployment Rates by Occupation	. Provide estimates of the number of unemployed workers and unemployment rates by occupation and industry in states and local labor areas based upon the 1980 Census. . Review the feasibility of producing estimates of annual average unemployment rates for more detailed occupations for states and major SMSA's on the basis of the expanded CPS household survey. . Modify the ES-203 survey to produce more detailed profiles of the occupational and industrial characteristics of the insured unemployed in states and local labor areas. . Determine the feasibility and potential usefulness of producing estimates of covered unemployment rates by occupation for states and local labor areas. . Provide information on the numbers and occupational characteristics of U.I. exhaustees in state and local labor areas. . Utilize ESARS data to provide more geographically disaggregated data on occupational characteristics of active ES job applicants.

Table 5-38. Recommendations for Improving Information on Occupational Supply in Local Labor Areas

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
Types of Existing Occupationally-Oriented lassroom and Apprenticeship Trainig Programs in Local Areas	. Develop statewide and local inventories of all existing occupationally-oriented classroom training and apprenticeship programs administered by public and private institutions at the secondary and post-secondary levels.
Sources of Labor Supply to Local Employers by Occupation	. Provide information on the sources of labor supply utilized by local firms in meeting their manpower needs within selected occupations.

occupations. Finally, table 5-4 will contain several recommendations for improving existing information on the immediate and longer term outcomes of local CETA employment and training programs, including the occupational characteristics of jobs obtained by terminees immediately upon termination and during the postprogram period.

In addition to presenting recommendations in each of the above areas, this chapter will also provide a series of suggestions for improving the use of local labor force and occupational information in the prime sponsor policy-making and program planning process. These recommendations will cover such issues as the nature of the CETA planning process, the development of effective strategic and technical planning capabilities at the prime sponsor level, relationships between the data producer and data user communities, and the roles of the NOICC and SOICC organizations in assisting in the development of more comprehensive labor force and occupational information systems for use in the planning and design of local CETA employment and training programs.

In preparing these recommendations, an explicit decision was made by the authors to emphasize the adoption of procedures that would not require the development of entirely the adoption of procedures that would not require the development of entirely new data bases. This decision was primarily adopted in order to reduce the cost of providing improved labor force and occupational information to local CETA prime sponsors. Many of our suggestions simply involve revisions in or expansions of the formats in which current data are published by the BLS and the SESA's, the more effective mining of data bases currently in existence, and increases in prime sponsor access to data bases posssessed by SESA's, the BLS, and other data producer agencies. Other recommendations involve changes in existing occupational coding procedures, expansion of existing household and establishment surveys, and, in a few instances, the implementation of a new type of survey to remedy specific deficiencies in the existing occupational information system.

The authors recognize that labor force and occupational information are not "free goods" and that today's prevailing political mood is not one supportive of additional resources being devoted to the public sector for an expansion of governmental services, particularly surveys of households and

Table 5-4. Recommendations for Improving Existing Information on the Outcomes and Occupational Outputs of CETA Employment and Training Programs

Type of Data or Information	Recommendations
Occupational Outputs of Local CETA Employment and Training Programs	. Develop a reporting system that will provide annual information on the occupations of jobs obtained by CETA program terminees on the basis of SOC codes; this system should also provide information on the beginning weekly wages of jobs obtained by CETA terminees.
Postprogram Employment and Earnings Experiences of CETA Terminees	. Utilize the existing CLMS system to provide continuous reports on the longer term outcomes and net impacts of various CETA employment and training programs, including the overall employment experiences, occupational employment and mobility experiences, and earnings experiences of terminees. . Develop and implement a follow-up reporting system for local CETA prime sponsors to provide selected information on the postprogram labor force, employment, and wage status of terminees; this system should also provide information on the occupational employment status of terminees in the 6- or 12-month period following program termination.

establishments. At the same time, however, it must be recognized that failure to remedy deficiencies in existing labor force and occupational information systems is not "costless." There are a number of costs involved in failing to improve the existing information system.

First, the failure to provide comprehensive information to policymakers on the numbers, characteristics, and problems of the unemployed and economically disadvantaged throughout the nation may lead to inappropriate overall funding levels for CETA programs and/or the adoption of legislative provisions, rules, and regulations that limit the ability of CETA prime sponsors to effectively resolve the problems of particular subgroups of the unemployed and the economically disadvantaged.[1] Such information deficiencies may also lead to unrealistic expectations for CETA performance in resolving poverty and unemployment problems. Second, the lack of reliable information on the geographic distribution of the unemployed and economically disadvantaged populations throughout the nation will lead to inequitable allocations of CETA monies to local prime sponsors.

Third, the lack of timely and reliable information on labor force and occupational employment developments at the local level may lead to improper targeting of local CETA funds and to failures to direct training and placement resources toward those local industries and occupations in which employment growth is occurring and shortages may exist. Fourth, the inability and/or unwillingness to adapt existing data bases to meet the more specific needs of users, such as CETA prime sponsors and public vocational education agencies, reduces the utility of such data bases and tends to raise questions about the overall usefulness of many of the current statistical programs of the BLS, the SESA's, and other Federal and state data producing agencies.

Finally, lack of close cooperation between data producers and users at the state and local level tends to create situations in which data users feel that they must create their own data systems to meet their specific policymaking and planning needs.[2] The creation of such dual data systems does require additional expenditures on data collection, processing, and analysis that may well have been more effectively utilized in bolstering capabilities of existing information systems to respond to the specific needs of local data users. Implementation of a number of the recommendations presented in this chapter may, thus, actually reduce expenditures on data collection and processing over time and hopefully will increase the effectiveness of existing employment and training programs.[3]

Recommendations for Improving Information on the Population, Labor Force, Incomes and Earnings, and the Economically Disadvantaged in CETA Prime Sponsor Areas

Local Population

The most current and comprehensive source of data on the size and demographic characteristics of the population in state and local areas is that recently collected by the Bureau of the Census as part of the 1980 Census of Population and Housing.[4] The population data collected on the short-form questionnaires administered to all households throughout the nation are capable of meeting the basic population data needs of CETA prime sponsors for preparing their master and annual plans. To be useful for CETA prime sponsor planning purposes, however, the 1980 population data will have to be provided on a prime sponsor and subgrantee planning area basis. The publication of such material will require special tabulations of the 1980 Census data similar to those provided by the Lawrence-Berkeley Laboratory of the University of California for the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration.[5]

In addition to having access to common tabulare formats containing the demographic and socioeconomic data from the 1980 Census, CETA prime sponsors should ideally be able to obtain public use tapes based upon the 1980 Census data that contain geographic identifiers for their planning areas, including subgrantee areas of balance-of-state prime sponsors.[6] The production of such public use tapes would allow CETA prime sponsors the option of conducting more detailed analyses of the population, labor force, and the economically disadvantaged in their area for program planning purposes. The availability of such comprehensive local data would likely provide more of an impetus for CETA prime sponsors to undertake substantive strategic planning at the local level. The preformating of labor force data for use by CETA prime sponsors in filling out the predesigned planning formats appearing in the Forms Preparation Handbook only leads to local planning being regarded simply as the production of "compliance documents" for the regional and national offices of ETA.

The findings of the 1980 Census with respect to the size and demographic characteristics of the population in prime sponsor planning areas should also be utilized to examine the accuracy of the population projections for CETA areas produced by the SESA's under the Labor Market Projections Model (LMPM) of ETA.[7] The findings of such analyses can then be utilized to modify the existing projections model in a manner that would allow it to produce more accurate population data for CETA prime sponsor areas for the intercensal years, 1981-1984.

Local Labor Force Data

The most comprehensive and current source of data on the labor force status of residents of CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas is that of the 1980 Census of Population and Housing. The long-form questionnaire was designed in part to collect information on the labor force status of all persons (15+) at the time of the survey and to determine the extent of their labor force participation in the previous calendar year, i.e., 1979.[8] The 1980 Census data generated by the long-form questionnaires can, thus, potentially be utilized to produce estimates of the labor force participation rates of various demographic (age, sex, racial/ethnic group) and socioeconomic groups (educational attainment, school enrollment status, and family income) in CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas at the time of the Census. Data on the degree of their labor force attachment during calendar year 1979 can also be generated.

An analysis of the data on labor force participation and attachment can then be undertaken by local CETA prime sponsor planners to identify those subgroups in the local planning area that are characterized by more severe labor force participation problems. CETA prime sponsors can then focus their efforts on these particular groups to equip them with the educational, training, and support services necessary to allow them to actively and successfully participate in the labor force. As noted earlier, overcoming barriers to the labor force participation of the economically disadvantaged in general of and displaced homemakers, minorities, high school dropouts, and the handicapped in particular is a basic national goal of CETA Title II programs.

In its final report to the President and the Congress, the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics recommended an expansion of the sample size of the monthly CPS household survey by approximately 42,000 households to improve the accuracy of the annual average estimates of unemployment for states, SMSA's containing 1 million or more persons, and the 11 largest central cities of the nation.[9] The Secretary of Labor has recently supported the recommendation for such an expansion, but has suggested that the sample expansion be designed to improve the accuracy of the unemployment estimates for the 125 largest SMSA's in the nation.[10] As the CPS sample expansion takes place, the BLS should undertake efforts to produce more detailed information on the labor force participation behavior of various demographic groups within states and major SMSA's throughout the nation than that currently provided in the Geographic Profiles of Employment and Unemployment.[11]

The Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor should also undertake a comprehensive analysis of the accuracy of the labor force projections for states, SMSA's, and CETA prime sponsor planning areas that were produced by the LMPM model. Findings of this assessment based upon a comparison of the 1980 Census labor force data and the LMPM's FY 80 labor force projections can then be utilized to modify the model in a manner that will improve the accuracy of these projections for the intercensal years. In modifying the LMPM model, ETA should attempt to incorporate as much state and SMSA-specific CPS-based data on changes in annual labor force participation rates for demographic groups as is feasible. The adoption of change factors based upon current labor force behavior of demographic groups in the state and/or SMSA in which the CETA prime sponsor is located, rather than in the nation as a whole, will likely lead to greater acceptance and use of the LMPM labor force projections by CETA prime sponsor planners.

Local Employment Data

The 1980 Census of Population and Housing will also provide the most comprehensive and timely source of data on the employment status of residents of CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas. The long-form questionnaire was used to collect information on both the employment status of persons (15+) at the time of the Census and their employment experiences during calendar year 1979, i.e., the number of weeks that they were employed during that year and the typical number of hours worked per week of employment.[12] These data can potentially be used to produce detailed demographic and socioeconomic profiles of the employed population in CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas, including estimates of the employment/population (E/P) for each of the above groups. An analysis of the data on these E/P ratios for selected demographic and socioeconomic groups within CETA prime sponsor planning areas can then be used to identify particular target groups for the delivery of employment and training services.

The long-form questionnaire used in conducting the 1980 Census also collected information on the occupations and industries of the jobs held by employed persons at the time of the Census. This information can be used by itself to construct profiles of the industrial and occupational composition of jobs held by residents at the time of the 1980 Census and can be combined with the data on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of job holders to provide insights into the occupational and industrial segmentation of various groups of workers, including youth, women, and racial/ethnic minorities. The findings of the above analysis can be utilized to identify nontraditional occupations for which CETA training may be provided to increase access of women and racial/ethnic minorities into occupational areas in which they have been traditionally underrepresented.[13]

The findings of the 1980 Census with respect to the levels and rates of employment for selected age/sex/racial-ethnic groups in CETA prime sponsor planning areas should be compared to the LMPM FY 80 employment projections for these demographic groups. Methods for improving the accuracy of the LMPM employment projections should be developed by ETA, and attempts should be made to incorporate into the LMPM projections model more state and SMSA specific CPS-based data on employment trends for demographic groups. Knowledge of current trends in employment/population ratios of demographic groups in CETA prime sponsor planning areas is critical to the proper targeting of CETA employment and training resources. The initiation of an expanded CPS household survey large enough to produce statistically reliable estimates of annual average E/P ratios for demographic subgroups in CETA prime sponsors is unfeasible at this time. The use of 1980 Census-based estimates of these ratios combined with estimates of their changes based upon the recommended expansions of the CPS survey in states and major SMSA's should be able to provide a mechanism for generating such information for CETA prime sponsors at a relatively low cost.

Local Unemployment Data

The 1980 Census data collected on the long-form questionnaires will also provide the most comprehensive and current information on the unemployment problems of demographic and socioeconomic groups in CETA prime sponsor planning areas. The unemployment data collected by the 1980 decennial census can be used to estimate the levels and rates of unemployment of demographic and socioeconomic subgroups of the CETA prime sponsor population at the time of the Census and to identify their unemployment experiences in the previous calendar year. Given the key role that the unemployment status of applicants plays in determining their eligibility for participation in CETA programs, the above information on the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the locally unemployed is critical to the identification of CETA-eligible individuals and the equitable allocation of CETA monies among various eligible subgroups.

The unemployment data generated by the expanded CPS household survey should be utilized by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to produce and publish more detailed estimates of the annual average unemployment rates of demographic groups in states, major SMSA's, and balance of states. These state and SMSA-specific unemployment rates for demographic groups should be incorporated to the maximum extent feasible into the LMPM model to project unemployment rates of selected demographic groups in CETA prime sponsor planning areas.

The existing ES-203 survey of the characteristics of the insured unemployed in states should be modified in a number of substantive ways by ETA to enable it to produce more geographically disaggregated data on the demographic, occupational, and industrial characteristics of all U.I. claimants. Profiles of the insured unemployed should be produced for local labor areas and CETA prime sponsor planning areas to increase the usefulness of the ES-203 data for CETA program planning purposes. Cross-classifications of the data on durations of unemployment claims and the demographic characteristics of U.I. claimants would also be useful in identifying those individuals potentially eligible for participation in CETA Title IID and VI PSE programs.

The SESA's and CETA prime sponsors should also be encouraged by ETA to conduct on-going surveys of unemployment insurance claimants to provide information useful to Job Service placement activities and to CETA prime sponsor program planning. These surveys would involve personal interviews with U.I. claimants to obtain information on their job search behavior, their current barriers to employment, their eligibility for CETA programs, their knowledge of available CETA resources and the conditions under which they would consider participating in various CETA employment and training programs. Such surveys should be able to provide information useful to strengthening ties between the local unemployment insurance and CETA systems, particularly with respect to the identification and retraining of workers displaced by plant shutdowns and technological changes in local industries.[14]

Earnings and Income Data

On the long-form questionnaire, the 1980 Census collected data from households on the earned incomes of all individuals (15+) in the previous calendar year. The earnings of individuals were categorized by wages and salaries, net income from nonfarm businesses and professional practices, and net farm income. The above data could be utilized to produce comprehensive profiles of the earnings of residents in various demographic and socioeconomic groups within CETA prime sponsor planning areas. The earnings data could also be combined with the data on the occupations and industries of jobs held by respondents to estimate the earnings potential of jobs in selected industries, occupations, and industry/occupation job clusters in local labor areas.[15] This type of earnings information would be useful in the selection of occupational areas for job training under CETA and in the placement of graduates of these programs.[16]

The long-form questionnaire of the 1980 Census was also utilized to collect information on the total income of individuals (15+) during calendar year 1979 and the sources of that income, including the receipt of public assistance income, such as SSI, AFDC, and general relief.[17] The income of individual household and family members can be summed to provide estimates of the total incomes of households and families during calendar year 1979. The household and family income data can be combined with data on the number and the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of household members, particularly primary earners, to provide information on the absolute and relative household and family income position of various subgroups of the resident population.[18] These income data can also be used to generate estimates of the size and characteristics of the OMB poverty population in CETA prime sponsor planning areas.

The anticipated expansion of the CPS household survey will increase the amount of information available on the earnings and incomes of households and families in states and regions throughout the nation. The earnings and income data collected as part of the March CPS supplement should be examined to determine the feasibility of producing annual estimates of the mean incomes of households and families and the number and proportion of poverty households in states and major SMSA's throughout the nation.[19] Such information would be useful in tracking changes in the income and poverty status of families and households within states during the intercensal years, 1980-84.[20]

Data on the Numbers and Characteristics of the Local Economically Disadvantaged Population

Given the recent increased emphasis by the Congress upon the delivery of employment and training services to the economically disadvantaged, CETA prime sponsor planners must have access to timely and reliable data on the number and characteristics of the local economically disadvantaged population. The 1980 Census data provide the most comprehensive and current source of data on the economically disadvantaged population. Together with data on household or family size and estimates of the BLS lower living standard budget for CETA prime sponsor planning area, the incomes data collected during the decennial census can be utilized by CETA planners and labor market analysts to produce estimates of the numbers and the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of economically disadvantaged individuals, households, and families in prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas.[21]

The data on the labor force status of individuals at the time of the Census and their employment and unemployment experiences during 1979 could be used to analyze the employment problems of the economically disadvantaged and the nature of their income inadequacy problems; i.e., low labor force attachment, lengthy periods of unemployment, inability to obtain full-time employment, and low weekly wages. The information on the occupations and industries of jobs obtained by the disadvantaged could also potentially be used to identify those jobs in the local area that fail to generate satisfactory earnings streams for workers. A subset of such jobs (ports of entry not tied to internal career ladders) may serve as appropriate targets for CETA Title IIC and VII worker upgrading programs.

The 1980 Census data on household and family incomes together with data on the labor force and school enrollment status of individuals living in such households can then be used to generate preliminary estimates of the numbers and the demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of individuals eligible for participation in various CETA employment and training programs.[22] These estimates would be incorporated into revised mater plans and serve as the primary basis for the selection of significant segments by CETA prime sponsors in their annual plans of service.

The expansion of the CPS household survey in states and major SMSA's should, during the next few years, be capable of providing some additional information on trends in the numbers and selected demographic characteristics of economically disadvantaged individuals. The limited numbers of observations in the March CPS survey on economically disadvantaged households for states and major SMSA's will, however, likely preclude the development of detailed estimates of the demographic, socioeconomic, and labor force characteristics of the economically disadvantaged for state and substate areas. To fill the void of timely and reliable data on the economically disadvantaged that will develop as the next few years go by, the Employment and Training Administration should give serious consideration to the funding during 1982 or 1983 of a one-time comprehensive household survey (similar to the 1976 Survey of Income and Education) designed to provide estimates of the numbers and characteristics of economically disadvantaged individuals in CETA prime sponsor planning areas.[23]

ETA and the SESA's should also place an increased emphasis upon more effective utilization of existing ESARS data for CETA program planning purposes. Reformating of the demographic, socioeconomic, and occupational data on the characteristics of Job Service applicants could be used to produce more relevant data on the economically disadvantaged within prime sponsor planning areas.[24] In addition to providing data on the characteristics of the economically disadvantaged, these special ESARS reports should also be designed to provide information on the types of services provided to the economically disadvantaged, including placements into unsubsidized employment and employment and training programs under CETA. The findings of these reports could be used in part to examine Job/Service CETA linkages and provide a mechanism for monitoring the nature and effectiveness of such linkages over time.

Recommendations for Improving Data on Local Industrial and Occupational Employment and Information on Occupational Characteristics for CETA Policymaking and Program Planning

Industry Employment Data

In chapter 4 of this report, it was noted that from a CETA program planning perspective the two most useful sources of data on local industry employment were those produced by the Current Employment Statistics (CES) program (also referred to as the BLS-790 Establishment Survey) and the ES-202 program. The employment data available from both of these sources can, however, be improved in a number of ways to increase their usefulness for CETA prime sponsor policymaking and program planning purposes. Recommendations for improving the CES employment data are presented first and are followed by those for the ES-202 program.

First, the CES wage and salary employment data for major industries at the state and SMSA level should be published in a historical series by the SESA's. In particular, annual average and quarterly industry employment data for the 1970 period onward (utilizing 1972 SIC codes) should be published by the SESA's.[25] The availability of such local industry employment data would allow CETA prime sponsors as well as planners in other employment and training agencies to analyze short- and long-term trends in the industrial structure of their local economies and to identify current growth sectors. Second, efforts should be undertaken by the BLS and the SESA's to develop appropriate seasonal adjustment factors for the monthly CES industry employment estimates for SMSA's as well as for states. Third, and most important, the CES survey's sample of establishments should be expanded, particularly outside the manufacturing sector, to provide more industry detail on wage and salary employment developments in states and SMSA's.[26] The industry detail provided by the current survey in most states and SMSA's is too limited, particularly in the wholesale and retail trade and private services sectors.

The industry employment data collected as part of the ES-202 program provide the most comprehensive source of data on local industry employment for use in planning CETA-related employment and training programs. As noted in the previous chapter, however, CETA prime sponsors have often encountered a number of problems, including data confidentiality issues, in obtaining access to the ES-202 employment data. As a result, the authors recommend that the NOICC and the SOICC's work closely with the SESA's and CETA prime sponsors to develop workable arrangements for making the ES-202 employment data available for planning use. Ideally, the ES-202 employment data would be available on a quarterly basis for each 3-digit SIC industry in each local labor area of the state and in CETA prime sponsor planning areas, where appropriate.[27]

The availability of a historical series (e.g., 1974 onward) for local industry employment data would also be particularly useful in the identification of growth and declining industries in local labor areas. To achieve this objective, it is imperative that SESA's revise their historical employment data for industries whenever SIC changes and other noneconomic changes occur in the ES-202 program. Failure to revise the historical employment series will adversely affect the utility of ES-202 data for analyzing local industry employment trends. Information on such trends is a key element of the planning process for CETA programs as well as a major input into the program for projecting industry and occupational employment in states and major labor areas.

Job Development Guides

In addition to obtaining information on trends in the levels of employment within local industries, CETA prime sponsors would also ideally have access to listings of establishments within local industries for use in the development of OJT contracts and in the job placement of graduates from classroom training and other local employment and training programs. The establishment listings available from the ES-202 program containing the names, addresses, SIC classifications, and employment size classes of employers would provide the basis for the production of such job development guides.[28] The OES data on occupational staffing patterns for three-digit SIC industries would serve as a useful supplement to the above establishment listings. The reformating of OES staffing patterns data could provide CETA prime sponsors information on the types of occupations that dominate particular industries within a state and the types of industries that dominate the employment of workers in particular occupations.[29]

These job development guides would be equally useful to Job Service employment interviewers and employment service representatives as well as to job developers in the public vocational education system. The SOICC's may be able to play a useful role in this area by opening up communications between the Job Service and employment and training agencies with respect to the desirability of such job development guides and by developing proper procedures for publishing, disseminating, and using such job development guides to improve the placement performance of all public employment and training agencies within the state.

Occupational Staffing Pattern Data

One of the basic components of a comprehensive occupational information system is timely and accurate data on the detailed occupational composition of industry employment at the state and local level. In chapter 4, two sources of such data were discussed. These were the OES survey program and data derived from the decennial census. The chapter concluded, however, that OES survey-based data were likely to be suprior to Census-based data for CETA planning purposes. The basic design of the OES survey appears to be quite sound; however, a number of improvements should be made within the survey, particularly with respect to its occupational classification system, in order to improve its usefulness for employment and training program planning purposes.

Short-term Improvements

Currently, only limited sub-state data on occupational employment are available from the OES survey. There is an existing need for industry staffing pattern data to be produced for major labor areas within a state. The NOICC has recently provided funding to the Colorado SOICC to examine the relative accuracy of a number of methodologies developed by BLS to produce sub-state staffing pattern data from existing statewide staffing pattern estimates. The primary goal of this project is to determine the feasibility of producing relatively accurate sub-state data, while avoiding the necessity of increasing the survey's sample size. Given the real financial constraints that exist within the OES program, as well as the likely ineffectiveness of increasing the sample size to produce sub-state data,[30] testing of the BLS sub-state methodologies should be vigorously pursued. At the conclusion of such testing, BLS should develop an exportable computer system based upon the most accurate methodology for use by SESA research agencies in producing sub-state staffing pattern data.

Longer-term Recommendations

A major limitation of the data produced under the OES survey program to date is its lack of comparability over time. Given such limitations, the data are incapable of providing an historical series that tracks changes in the occupational composition of industry employment. In large part, this lack of historical comparability has occurred as a result of the fact that the program at its inception relied upon a new occupational classification system that has been in the process of development over the past decade. At that time, it was recognized that a trade-off existed between using a "stable" classification system useful in time series analysis and developing a new system that reflected real job content.[31] The choice was to develop a new system in the short-run that would eventually be supplanted by a national standard occupational classification system that was in the early states of development at that time.[32] The OES survey program has collected data from business establishments since 1971. At the beginning, the OES occupational classification system was composed of some 1,700 job titles and definitions. Over time that same system had grown to some 2,200 titles and definitions although the flow of job titles in and out of the system has been greater than this. This growth partly occurred as a result of the expansion of the survey program into additional industries, such as Education and Health, that required specialized job lists. In addition, user demands necessitated the addition of more detailed occupational titles and definitions.[33] As noted earlier, this list of occupations has recently been reduced to 1,600 titles.

Consequently, as the survey program has evolved, changes in and additions to the classification system were required. The absence of a historical series on occupational employment, however, is a serious deficiency in the OES program. The survey has existed for nearly ten years, a sufficiently long period of time to adapt titles and definitions to varied data uses. At a minimum, BLS should undertake the task of revising their OES classification system a final time in such a manner as to be useful for historical purposes as well as to meet various specialized data user needs. In undertaking this revision, serious consideration should be given to the adoption of the recently published Standard Occupational Classification system as the system of job titles and definitions to be used in the OES survey program. While the SOC is not necessary for historical comparability, it will likely prove to be necessary if comparability of OES with other data bases is to be achieved. If the OES survey program is to serve as the basis for a comprehensive OIS, as we believe it should, then the system of occupational classification that it employs must be comparable with that used in other occupational information data bases. The use of complex cross-classification schemes will not likely prove workable, particularly at the state and local level. Consequently, the adoption of the SOC as the classification system for the key data bases of an OIS seems to be the only workable long-term solution.

A second major recommended change in the OES survey focuses upon the paucity of survey based data that are published at the state level in some states and the almost complete lack of data at the sub-state level. Lack of publishable occupational data at the state and sub-state level primarily occurs as a result of high relative error measures associated with the estimates of employment in a given occupation and to problems of nonresponse.[34] BLS publications criteria tend to preclude the publication of more substantial occupational detail since a large number of occupational employment estimates are characterized by extraordinary high rates of sampling error. While one could argue that the BLS publications criteria are too stringent, this does not appear to be the estimate falling within a given range over a infinite number of samples. It is a measure of variability in characteristics of the units being measured, which, in this case, represents variability of staffing patterns among business establishments. OES survey sampling variability is extraordinarily large. These differences among firms within the OES sample can be accounted for by a number of factors.

First, it may be that the survey's sample size is too small, so that the existing sample size is inadequate to provide a true representation of industry-occupation employment. The OES survey, however, is quite large, covering with certainty all establishments that employ more than 250 workers. While data on the proportion of employment covered within the OES survey nationally is unavailable, such data are available for the state of Massachusetts. The 1977 OES manufacturing survey sample included 5,115 business establishments with employment of 559,244, or approximately 93 percent of the state's 1976 (sample benchmark) manufacturing employment total. The Massachusetts 1978 non-manufacturing survey sample included 5,461 business establishments that contained 265,675 jobs, or about 50 percent of the state's 1977 non-manufacturing employment level.[35]

Second, the OES occupational classification system appears to be a major source of inter-firm variance as measured by OES relative error estimates as well as inter-industry differences after 3- and 4-digit SIC level. The OES titles and definitions, with a few exceptions, are defined in a relatively narrow way. For example, findings of the 1977 OES manufacturing survey reveal that, within a given two-digit industry, only two or three occupations had reported employment in at least 50 percent of the responding establishments.[36] Although only a rough indication, this finding, in conjunction with OES relative error estimates, indicates a great deal of inter-firm variability in measured staffing patterns. A likely source of such measured variability is the definitions and titles utilized by the OES occupational classification system. As noted above, the OES system employs a somewhat narrow system of job definitions and titles, rather than a system based upon clusters of jobs grouped for similarities in job content. By choosing one title within a given cluster rather than another, a respondent contributes to inter-firm staffing pattern variability. Information on such variability may be necessary, in spite of the costs associated with a high sampling variability, if occupational titles delineate jobs with unique skill requirements. At the same time, however, information on detailed occupations is useful only to the extent to which the data are of publishable quality.[37]

The extent to which the OES classification system in fact distinguishes among jobs with unique skill requirements is not known at this time. The degree to which OES survey estimates are suppressed appears, however, to be extensive due to high estimated relative errors associated with substantial inter-firm staffing pattern variation.[38] In view of these serious shortcomings from a user's perspective, the national office of the BLS should begin meeting with OES data users, particularly at the local level, in an effort to develop an understanding of the usefulness and limitations of the OES classification system.

Additionally, experiments with OES data collection should be conducted using the more broadly defined SOC system. Such experiments should focus upon the sampling errors associated with estimates derived from the SOC and upon the relative usefulness of the OES and SOC classification systems for major local data users, particularly CETA planning staff.

It should be noted that, in addition to increasing the amount of publishable information, a substantial reduction in OES sampling variability may also permit the production of statistically reliable OES estimates at the sub-state level without resorting to alternative techniques that are not based on actual local staffing pattern information.

Successful implementation of a number of the above recommendations would likely allow more detailed data from the OES survey to be published and made available to the public. The greater availability of DES data are occupational employment levels and occupational staffing patterns by industry would likely increase the use of such data not only by CETA prime sponsors, but also by vocational education agencies, community colleges, and other public and private educational, training, and employment institutions. As noted previously in this report, the Occupational Employment Statistics Program is the critical central element of an occupational information system. Given its key role, the authors recommend that substantive Department of Labor support be provided for its continued operation and expansion. The existence of an effective OES program at the national and state level is essential to the development of a viable and comprehensive occupational information system.

Labor Turnover and Accessions Data

Two major sources of data in labor turnover and accessions by industry and one source of data on new hires by occupation were described in chapter 4. The first two sources, the Labor Turnover Survey and the Employment Service Potential project, were designed primarily to produce estimates of labor turnover and accessions by industry, with no occupational detail. The ESP project was designed primarily as an operational tool for use by SESA's in evaluating their job placement performance and in identifying those industries for which job development and placement efforts would most likely prove profitable. A number of major limitations of the ESP project were noted, including the following:

(i) Unavailability of an ESP data base for all states;

(ii) Lack of information on types of separations;

(iii)Problems in identifying the geographic location of new hires;

(iv) Lack of information on the occupational or wage characteristics of new hires.

While the outputs of the ESP program appears to be quite useful for the set of operational tasks associated with Employment Service job development and placement, the current ESP data are somewhat limited in their usefulness for CETA program planning. The lack of information on the sources of labor turnover coupled with the lack of occupational and wage rate information severely restrict ESP's usefulness within the CETA planning process. At the same time, however, it should be noted that, to the extent to which detailed ESP data are made available to local CETA job development and placement staff, they could be of substantial use in targeting placement efforts to specific industries and firms. The NOICC and SOICC organizations could potentially play an expanded role in this information sharing process by assisting in the development of agreements between SESA's and prime sponsors for sharing job development and placement information.[39]

Estimates of labor turnover and accessions produced by the BLS-SESA labor Turnover Survey are used primarily as a national macroeconomic indicator of trends in overall economic activity. Data from the LTS program are published on a national basis and for states and large metropolitan areas. Problems with the overall accuracy of the LTS estimates, a lack of coverage of major industrial sectors outside of manufacturing, limited geographic coverage, and the absence of occupational and wage characteristics are among the major limitations of LTS data for CETA planning purposes.

The data produced by the LTS program on types of accessions and separations (e.g., new hires, recalls, quits, layoffs, fires), however, can provide useful inputs into the CETA planning process as described in chapter 3. Consequently, the authors recommend that efforts should be undertaken by the BLS and the SESA's to improve the overall usefulness of the Labor Turnover Survey for CETA planning purposes. In the immediate period, little can be done to improve the usefulness of LTS data. Until studies designed to examine the sources of error within the existing LTS program are completed and until appropriate changes are made in the sample and survey design, it would likely prove futile to make other types of changes within the existing survey program.

Upon the completion of on-going BLS studies designed to improve the quality of data derived from the LTS program, efforts should be undertaken to expand the industrial coverage and geographic detail of the survey. Such efforts should emphasize expansion of the survey into the nonmanufacturing sectors. Ideally, such an expansion would be designed to increase the LTS sample size to allow the production of labor accession and turnover estimates at the two-digit SIC level for states and for major local labor areas.

The discussion of occupational new hires data within chapter 4 focused upon the new hires component of the BLS-SESA Pilot Job Openings Survey. This part of the JOS pilot project was designed to produce data on the occupational composition of new hires. Unfortunately, no estimates derived from this collection effort have yet been published. In addition, findings on the feasibility of simultaneously collecting new hires and job openings data by occupation have not yet been developed. Consequently, it would be premature at this time to discuss the usefulness of data derived from this program for CETA planning purposes.

As outlined in chapter 3, data on the occupational composition of new hires as well as estimates of new hire rates by occupation are potentially key data inputs into the CETA planning process. A comprehensive Federal-state data collection effort designed to produce data on the occupational composition of new hires, that is comparable in occupational classification with the staffing pattern data derived from the OES survey program, should be undertaken. Such an effort should be capable, in conjunction with available OES survey data, of producing occupational new hire rates for states and major local labor areas on a quarterly basis.

Job Vacancy Data

Aside from the job orders listed with SESA job banks, little information on the level and occupational composition of job openings exists for use by CETA planning staff at the local level. Data derived from help-wanted advertising are of little value for substantive planning purposes. Despite a number of major limitations, job openings data derived from SESA job banks may be of some value to CETA planning staff, particularly when accompanied by narrative descriptions of trends in industry employment and labor turnover. While such data would not be useful for analyzing the causes of unemployment within a labor market, they may prove useful in identifying selected occupations suitable for CETA training. Analysis of trends in job orders for an occupation along with wage data, occupational employment data, and labor accessions and turnover data might well prove useful in assessing potential payoffs from the provision of training within a given occupation.

It should be noted, however, that the job openings data available from SESA job banks are an inadequate substitute for a comprehensive job vacancy survey. Only a job openings survey similar in design to the existing BLS pilot Job Openings Survey (JOS) would be capable of meeting the range of analytical needs for job openings data at the state and local level. The design of the BLS pilot JOS survey possesses a number of characteristics that are desirable for producing job openings data useful for CETA planning purposes. Chief among these characteristics is the conceptual comparability between the definition of unemployment that is currently employed in the CPS household survey and the job openings definition employed within the JOS program. In addition, the occupational lists included on the job openings form are sufficiently detailed to substantially aid analysts in identifying occupational imbalances.

The major shortcoming of the design of the current JOS pilot project from a CETA program planning perspective centers upon its sample size. The current sample size of the JOS consists of approximately 1,200 establishments within each state. This sample was designed to produce only statewide estimates of job openings by occupation. Although the JOS pilot projects were designed as a result of national desires for such information, the major beneficiaries of information on the level and occupational composition of job openings would be local employment and training staff. As a result, if BLS decides to undertake a comprehensive job vacancy survey, that survey should be designed to enable it to produce estimates of job openings by major industry group (1 digit SIC) and by detailed occupation for state and major local labor areas on a quarterly basis.

Projections of Employment by Industry and Occupation at the State and Substate Level

Discussions within chapter 4 of this report revealed that systematic short-term projections of employment in selected occupations or industry/occupation job clusters do not currently exist at either the state or local area level. Given the state of the art of short-term industry employment forecasting and the expense associated with these efforts, it appears highly unlikely that short-term projections (1-2 years) of employment for occupations or selected industry/occupation clusters will become available in the foreseeable future for CETA program planning purposes. Consequently, it appears that, in spite of their many limitations, specifically targeted local employer surveys that ask employers to make short-term projections of employment and hiring within selected occupation/industry job clusters is the only feasible alternative available that is capable of producing such information. It should be emphasized that such an effort would rely on existing occupational employment staffing patterns data and industry/occupational employment projections to identify the specific set of job clusters to be studied. Using the concepts of growth and replacement demand currently employed in the BLS-SESA projections system, the survey would ask local employers falling within its scope to make employment and hiring projections over a specific time period only for a preselected set of occupations. Such a survey would not be duplicative of the existing State and Area Projections Program since it is targeted only at specific occupations within selected local industries and provides a projection for a substantially shorter time period than that used in the existing projections program.

Chapter 4 outlined four major limitations of the existing state and Area Projections Program which is designed to produce long-term, cross-industry occupational employment estimates and estimates of the annual average number of job openings by occupation during the time period covered by the projections, e.g., 1976-1985. The first two problems were related to the frequency with which both industry employment projections and separation rates for occupations are updated. Industry employment projections should be updated relatively frequently (every 2-3 years) to reflect more recent economic developments within state and local labor areas. Such updates would incorporate the most recent years' industry employment developments into the historical employment data used in making the projections. Discussions in chapter 4 also indicated that the separation rates used to derive estimates of annual average job openings by occupation due to replacement demand are also updated infrequently. Data from the expanded CPS household survey, however, should permit more regional and state specific projections of labor force participation rates for age/sex groups that are used in estimating separation rates. Such more localized labor force participation rates combined with data on the age/sex composition of the employed by occupation in states based upon the 1980 Census should improve estimates of annual average job openings.

A third limitation of the State and Area Projections Program is the lack of comprehensive assessments of the accuracy of the state and area projections data. Previous discussions indicated that the acceptability and use of employment projections data by CETA prime sponsors and vocational education agencies will likely depend upon knowledge of the accuracy of the projections. Such assessments, however, will likely be limited to rather broad industrial and occupational groupings and will be substantially hindered by changes that have occurred in the industrial and occupational classification systems over time. In addition, developing an understanding of the sources of measured error in projections will be frustrating given the wide latitude that SESA staff can exercise in refining the projections for "reasonableness."

Given what appears to be a set of major barriers to a comprehensive assessment of the accuracy of the state and area projections data, the case for more frequent updates of the employment projections data becomes more compelling. In addition, however, efforts should be undertaken to critically assess the methodologies currently employed in the projections program and to examine the usefulness of alternative approaches. The NOICC and SOICC network should actively engage in discussions with CETA prime sponsor and vocational education agency staff to determine their perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the projections methodology and its outputs.

A final limitation of the projections program centered upon the current inability of the annual average job openings estimates to distinguish between "internal" and "external" job openings. External openings would represent job openings directly available to workers from outside of the firm. The inability to distinguish between these two types of openings will lead to both under- and over-statements of the number of annual average job openings within occupations that will be available to outside jobseekers. Information on ports of entry and internal career ladders within local industries is necessary to provide insights into this issue. Given the need for such information for only a sub-set of industry/occupation job clusters and given the frequently unique characteristics of firms' internal labor markets, CETA prime sponsor planners could best develop such information through local employer surveys.

Recommendations Relating to Data on Wages and Hours of Work by Occupation; the Structure of Local Firms' Internal Labor Markets; and Local Establishment Hiring Policies and Patterns

The availability of data on wages and hours of work by occupation, the structure of local firms' internal labor markets, and their hiring policies and practices is currently quite limited. Only data on wage rates by occupation are currently collected in a systematic way. The discussions of such wage data included in chapter 4 revealed that, with the exception of selected SESA sponsored wage surveys, they were of limited value for CETA program planning purposes. In addition, there does not exist any on-going systematic efforts to capture information on the structure of local firms' internal labor markets or their hiring policies and practices. Clearly, major occupational information gaps exist at the local level. Unfortunately, there appears to be no ideal mechanism to close or even narrow these information gaps in a systematic way in the short run. The development of methods to capture such specialized information will likely necessitate a departure from traditional approaches to the development of labor market information.[40] The need by CETA prime sponsor staff for establishment-specific information on the characteristics of selected industry/occupation job clusters will likely necessitate the development of an in-house data collection capability at the prime sponsor level. The existing Federal-state cooperative statistical system is designed to produce multipurpose aggregate information and is limited by confidentiality and other types of restrictions in its ability to produce establishment specific data.[41]

Since the advent of the new Title VII Private Sector Initiatives Program, created under the 1978 CETA amendments, prime sponsors have engaged in a wide variety of in-house data collection activities. Such local data collection efforts, however, have frequently been characterized by a number of problems related to data quality and usefulness. In addition, some of the data collection efforts were designed to produce information that already existed. Many of these problems seem to be due to the fact that prime sponsors have often conducted local employer surveys in isolation, without seeking technical assistance from SOICC's and SESA's. Some of the duplication of effort may have been avoided through open discussions with one or both of these agencies. Improvements in the quality and usefulness of the data generated by such surveys would have likely occurred if CETA prime sponsors had the opportunity to gain access to selected SESA data files and to become acquainted with SESAs' experience in data collection.

Unfortunately, with the exception of New England, few efforts appear to have been undertaken to bring together SOICC's, SESA's, and prime sponsors to discuss methods for systematically planning and coordinating local employer surveys designed to meet the specialized information needs of the CETA system.[42] In the absence of such a coordinated approach to local employer surveys, prime sponsors will likely continue to employ an ad hoc approach to data collection in order to meet the increasing information requirements of the CETA system. While such ad hoc approaches may eventually provide useful information for CETA prime sponsor planning purposes, as prime sponsors individually become more experienced with data collection, it seems that a more systematic approach by SESA's, SOICC's, and prime sponsors would provide a more efficient and effective system for producing such data. The Education Amendments of 1976 that established the NOICC and its network of SOICC's mandated the development of occupational information systems capable of producing data on the demand and supply of labor based upon uniform definitions, estimating procedures, and classification systems. Given this mandate, it seems imperative that the NOICC through its SOICC network begin to bring together major data producers and users, including staff from CETA prime sponsors, PIC's, vocational education agencies, and the SESA's. The purpose of such a forum would be to define proper roles for local employer surveys and to facilitate the employer survey process by making SESA data and expertise available to parties interested in conducting such surveys. In this way, the major goals of eliminating duplication of effort in data collection and producing useful information for planning purposes based upon standardized concepts and techniques can begin to be achieved.

The Occupational Characteristics of the Unemployed

Among the occupational supply data that would be useful for CETA program planning purposes is that of data on the occupational characteristics of the unemployed in state and local labor areas. As was noted in chapter 4 of this study, there is little comprehensive information available on the occupational characteristics of the unemployed in state and local labor areas that is useful for planning CETA job training programs. A number of recommendations for improving this situation are presented below.

First, employment and unemployment data from the long-form questionnaire used in conducting the 1980 Census should be used to generate estimates of unemployment rates in occupations and industries within states and local labor areas. These data should provide some insights into disparities in unemployment rates among local occupations and industries and indicate potential areas of occupational shortages and surpluses. Unfortunately, there are no comprehensive data on job vacancies and vacancy rates by occupation against which these occupational unemployment data can be compared.[43]

Second, the BLS should investigate the possibilities of using CPS survey data to produce estimates of annual average unemployment rates by occupation for states and major SMSA's at a greater level of occupational detail than that provided to date in the Geographic Profiles publications. The feasibility of producing annual average unemployment rates for more detailed occupations should be increased once the sample size of the CPS household survey is expanded in accord with recommendations provided by the National

Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics recently supported (with modification) by the Secretary of Labor.

Third, the recommended changes in the ES-203 survey noted earlier in this chapter should be accompanied by an expansion in the degree of occupational data on the insured unemployed for states and local labor areas. Attempts to develop estimates of covered unemployment rates by occupation in state and local labor areas should be supported by NOICC.[44] In the authors' views, however, the estimation of occupational unemployment rates for states and local labor areas that would be useful for CETA program planning purposes would require 100 percent sampling of U.I. claimants in the ES-203 Survey, substantial changes in the procedures used to code the occupations of unemployment insurance claimants, the availability of local labor area data on occupational employment from the OES survey program, and changes in the occupational classification systems used in conducting the ES-203 and OES surveys.

Finally, the ESARS reporting system should continue to be used to provide information on the occupational characteristics of active applicants in local ES offices. These data should be provided on a quarterly basis for all local labor areas, and a historical data series on the numbers of active applicants by occupation should be developed by the SESA's to allow trend analysis of the applicant data. Frequent purging of the active files is essential to guarantee the reliability and timeliness of the occupational data on active applicants. While not all ES active applicants are officially "unemployed," knowledge of their numbers, occupational characteristics, and employment problems could potentially be useful in determining the need for additional training in particular occupational areas in local labor markets.

Information on Occupationally-Oriented Classroom Training and Apprenticeship Programs

CETA prime sponsors are required to give consideration to existing institutional training sources, particularly public vocational education schools and apprenticeship programs, in selecting service deliverers for their occupationally-oriented training activities. As revealed in chapter 4 of this report, existing information on the activities and outputs of institutional training schools, both public and private, is extraordinarily diffused. Attempts to pull together all of the reporting forms prepared by these training institutions and apprenticeship programs would prove to be extraordinarily complex and burdensome for many CETA prime sponsors, particularly the large central city and balance of state prime sponsors. In addition to the lack of a comprehensive and uniform reporting system for institutional training programs, the data reported by the various institutions vary from one another in terms of concepts and occupational classification systems. While methodologies for comparing the data provided under various occupational classification systems are being developed, including comprehensive occupational cross-code indices, the tasks involved in combining the disparate data are beyond the means of all but a few CETA prime sponsors.

From a practical local program planning standpoint, what is needed in the way of information on institutional training activities is that of a comprehensive inventory of all existing occupationally-oriented classroom training and apprenticeship programs within the local prime sponsor planning area and contiguous areas. This inventory would contain a listing of essentially all occuptionally-oriented classroom training activities administered in the prime sponsor planning area by public and private training institutions at the secondary and post-secondary level, including associate degree programs in four-year universities and colleges. The inventory would provide information on the occupational areas for which training is provided by the institution, the level of training, the criteria for entry into such programs, the tuition costs (if appropriate), and the placement performance of the program, whenever such information is available.

The above institutional training resource inventories would be useful to CETA prime sponsors in not only meeting the requirements for the development of the master plan, but also in preparing the annual plan. The selection of contractors for training activities under Titles IIB, IIC, IID, IV, and VII of CETA would have to take into consideration the available training resources in the community, the willingness of such institutions to cooperate with CETA, and their "demonstrated effectiveness" as revealed by available placement and follow-up data. The SOICC's should be able to play a leadership role in the development of such institutional training resource inventories, relying on inputs from the public and private training community, apprenticeshipment programs, existing Career Information Systems, and the State Employment and

Training Councils (SETC). The development and active use of such inventories would likely have a favorable impact upon improving coordination between the CETA system and other local educational and training agencies. The achievement of an integrated and coordinated local employment and training system was a major objective of the 1978 CETA reauthorization legislation.

In addition to the development of the above inventories of existing occupationally-oriented classroom training and apprenticeship programs within local prime sponsor planning areas, it would also be desirable for CETA prime sponsors to have access to information on the actual sources of labor supply that local firms utilize in obtaining workers in various occupations. This labor supply source information would only be produced for those occupations that are projected to be characterized by favorable numbers of annual job openings and that are believed to be appropriate candidates for the CETA or the public vocational education system's training programs.

Freedman and Dutka have argued the case for the need for information on the sources of labor supply by occupation to employers in the following manner:

> The felt needs of employers can best be deduced from what they do rather than what they say, including not only the training programs they offer, but the sources they use to recruit new workers. By "sources," we do not mean whether the hiring process involves direct application, placing a help-wanted ad, or using an employment agency. We mean the source of the worker's training (if any) for example, a vocational school, the armed forces, prior experience, etc. Among other things, the planner must know what the competition is--which existing programs are supplying workers and where a proposed new program will fit in.[45]

Data on the actual sources of labor supply utilized by local employers to meet their manpower needs in specific occupational areas would ideally be supplemented by information on employers' perceptions of the relative effectiveness of alternative sources of supply. Knowledge of the relative role and perceived effectiveness of alternative institutional supply sources in meeting the employment and training needs of private and public sector employers could be used in part to determine the "demonstrated effectiveness" of various local training programs. Such information on the perceived "demonstrated effectiveness" of alternative institutional training sources would then be utilized by CETA prime sponsors as a basis for selecting contractors for the delivery of classroom training services.

Research in the above areas would seem to be an appropriate function for the Private Industry Councils. Well designed studies on alternative sources of occupational supply would not only provide information essential to the development of comprehensive occupational information systems, but should also provide useful insights on the strengths and limitations of existing local training programs. Such employer-based assessments could then be used by CETA and public vocational education agencies to modify the nature and contents of their training programs in a manner that will more effectively satisfy the employment and training needs of local employers, particularly in the more highly skilled occupational areas where "shortages" of skilled manpower may well exist.

Occupational Outputs and Employment and Earnings Impacts of CETA Programs

A description of the types of information on program performance that CETA prime sponsors are currently required to submit to the Regional Offices of the Employment and Training Administration was presented in chapter 4 of this report. The discussion noted that CETA prime sponsors are not currently required to provide information to the Employment and Training Administration on the occupations or industries of the jobs obtained by program terminees nor are they required to conduct formal follow-up surveys of the postprogram employment and earnings experiences of these terminees.

In the 1978 CETA reauthorization legislation, Congress called upon the Secretary of Labor to develop a uniform system for use by CETA prime sponsors in reporting information on enrollments, completions, placements, and training-related placements from their classroom training and OJT activities. During the past year, NOICC has funded a pilot project to develop appropriate methods for collecting such occupational information from CETA prime sponsors. The authors believe that a systematic collection of information on the occupational outputs of training programs administered by CETA prime sponsors should be given a high priority by the Employment and Training Administration. An annual report providing information on the occupations (based on SOC codes) of unsubsidized jobs obtained by training program terminees and the weekly wages of those jobs should be prepared for the Employment and Training Administration by CETA prime sponsors.

In the Statement of Purpose for the 1978 CETA Amendments, Congress emphasized that employment and training services provided under the Act should not only enhance the employability and economic self-sufficiency of participants but also result in an increase in their earned incomes during the postprogram period. To assist in the determination of the impact of various CETA services upon the postprogram employment and earnings of participants, the Employment and Training Administration funded a Contiguous Longitudinal Manpower Survey (CLMS). During the past year, ETA has undertaken efforts to develop comparison groups for use in estimating the net employment and earnings impacts of various types of CETA services, including classroom training, OJT, and PSE.[46]

The authors believe that the continuous, detailed analysis of CLMS data to determine the net employment and earnings impacts of CETA employment and training services should be given a high priority by the Employment and Training Administration. We also recommend that the data on the postprogram employment and earnings experiences of CETA terminees be utilized to provide information on the occupations and industries of the jobs obtained by these terminees, the degree of occupational mobility achieved by terminees between the pre- and post-CETA periods, and the wage and occupational mobility of terminees during the entire postprogram period. In addition, efforts should be made to estimate the independent effects of the occupational areas of training and the durations of such training periods upon the earnings and employability of participants. Knowledge of the differential effects of various occupational training programs upon the postprogram employment and earnings of CETA participants would be particularly useful in guiding the future allocations of CETA training monies.

Finally, the authors recommend that a greater emphasis be placed by the Employment and Training Administration upon the development of local follow-up capabilities by CETA prime sponsors. The development by ETA of minimum follow-up standards that would have to be adhered to by all CETA prime sponsors during FY 81 would seem to be a proper first step in this process. The degree of sophistication of these local follow-up systems would be expected to vary substantially among prime sponsors.[47] The local follow-up systems would not be designed to be duplicative of the national CLMS survey, and most would not be expected to be used to conduct net impact evaluations based upon nonparticipant comparison groups.

The follow-up systems would, at a minimum track the labor force, employment, and wage status of terminees at particular points within a 6- to 12-month period following termination from the local CETA system. Included in this database would be information on the occupations, industries, and wages of the jobs held by terminees at the time of the follow-up contact. The more sophisticated follow-up systems would provide a comprehensive tracking of the entire labor force, employment, and earnings experiences of terminees during the follow-up period and would attempt to assess the relative effectiveness of alternative types of employment and training strategies in enhancing the employability and earned incomes of the economically disadvantaged. These local follow-up systems would hopefully be viewed by CETA prime sponsors not simply as compliance reporting systems, but as viable mechanisms for effectively managing and assessing the performance of the operations of the local CETA systems.

Recommendations for Improving the Use of Labor Market and Occupational Information by CETA Prime Sponsors

The final section of this report is designed to provide a brief, but rather wide ranging series of recommendations for improving the use of labor market and occupational information in the local CETA policymaking and planning process. If each of these recommendations were successfully implemented by the appropriate employment and training agencies, the authors believe that the use of labor market and occupational information in the CETA planning process would be substantially improved.

It should be noted at this point, however, that the authors do not view labor market and occupational information as panaceas for the employment and training system. Well-informed observers of American labor markets would recognize that a number of the major unemployment and poverty problems of the nation cannot be successfully resolved in a substantial manner simply through an increase in the efficiency of the existing CETA employment and training system or even through a moderate increase in the available level of resources for CETA programs. A number of our unemployment and underemployment problems stem from the inability of the American economy to generate sufficient job opportunities for all individuals who want to work and from an inability of the economy to generate sufficient job opportunities offering employment that is stable enough and hourly wages that are high enough to allow all primary earners in families to earn incomes substantial enough to allow their families to escape from the ranks of the economically disadvantaged.

We believe that CETA programs have an important role to play in providing training and employment opportunities to disadvantaged workers. These programs should enable such workers to more effectively compete for available job opportunities in local labor markets, thereby facilitating the attainment of equal employment opportunity objectives. They should also assist in addressing particular types of skill shortage problems. By themselves, however, they cannot currently be expected to have a major impact upon our overall employment and underemployment problems. Improved labor market and occupational information has a critical role to play in increasing the effectiveness of existing CETA programs, but they should not be expected by themselves to provide the ultimate solutions to our nation's employment problems.

The following seven general recommendations are offered to improve the use and usefulness of local labor market and occupational information in the CETA planning process:

(i) The Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor should systematically review the existing planning requirements imposed upon CETA prime sponsors. Experienced labor market analysts would readily recognize that a number of the data elements which prime sponsors are asked to present in their master and annual plans are simply not available from existing labor market and occupational information systems. This is particularly true of the required data on the numbers and characteristics of CETA eligible individuals by CETA title. The authors recognize that the eligibility criteria contained in the legislation itself poses the need for such planning data. The long-term solution to this problem will thus require closer cooperation between Congressional Committees, the White House, and major data producer agencies, including BLS, ETA, the Census Bureau and the SESA's.[48] Such improved communication is essential to guarantee that either existing data are available to meet planning requirements or that sufficient additional resources will be made available to Federal and state data producers to generate the requisite information;

(ii) Increasing the availability and quality of local labor force and occupational information will likely lead to an improvement in their use only if CETA prime sponsors are required to undertake substantive strategic and tactical planning in the preparation of their master and annual plans. It thus seems imperative that the national and regional offices of ETA undertake more systematic and comprehensive reviews of the annual plans of CETA prime sponsors to guarantee that the targeting portions of the plan and the service delivery strategies are justified on the basis of both available labor market and occupational information and data on the past performance of local employment and training programs;

(iii) The development of an effective strategic and tactical planning capability by CETA prime sponsors is likely to be critically dependent upon the availability of experienced professional planning staff who are well trained in the use of labor market and occupational information.[49] The development of such an experienced and trained staff will likely be facilitated through ETA establishment of on-going educational and training programs for CETA planners and SESA labor market analysts in each region of the nation. Recent efforts in this area by the LMI division of ETA appear to be promising for the development of such a professional capability;

(iv) Increased dialogue between the data producing and data using communities at the regional, state, and local level would likely be useful in improving CETA prime sponsor knowledge and use of available sources of labor force and occupational information. The SOICC's should be able to play a leadership role in this area by bringing together major actors in the data producer and user communities. The development of statewide CETA Planners' Task Forces and Vocational Education Planning Task Forces similar to those in the state of Massachusetts appears to provide one potentially effective forum for the exchange of information between the data producer and user communities;

(v) The development of effective comprehensive occupational information systems for use in planning employment and training programs at the state and local level will be dependent upon the production of occupational supply and demand data that can be directly compared to one another. The existence of occupational data bases utilizing substantially different occupational classification systems (Census, DOT, OES, OE, SOC) adversely influences the ability of planners to utilize information from diverse sources. While the development of more comprehensive and timely occupational cross-code indices can somewhat alleviate this problem, the authors strnngly recommend that NOICC give serious consideration to the adoption of a national policy that would require SOC classification systems to be used in most survey programs of the BLS and SESA's and the reporting systems of occupationally-oriented educational and job training agencies;[50]

(vi) A number of the recommendations presented in this report will require increased resources to be devoted to the collection and production of labor force and occupational information at the state and local level. The authors strongly recommend that increased LMI resources be made available by ETA to the BLS and particularly the SESA's to generate a number of the data elements outlined in this report. It is also recommended, however, that CETA prime sponsors be given a formal role in the determination of the types of additional LMI and occupational information products that will be produced by the SESA's;

(vii) While substantial progress has been made during the past few years in developing labor market and occupational information systems for use by state and local employment and training agencies, substantive gaps in these systems do exist, particularly with respect to knowledge of the internal labor markets, hiring practices and policies, and sources of labor supply by occupation to local firms. To improve our knowledge of these issues, which are critical to the proper planning and design of local employment and training programs, the authors recommend that NOICC and the SOICC's play an active leadership role in formulating strategies for use by SESA's, CETA prime sponsors, PIC's, and public vocational education agencies to fill these gaps, including the use of well-designed local employer surveys.[51] Such surveys, in our view, can effectively supplement information available from general purpose statistical surveys and contribute to the development of truly comprehensive labor market and occupational information systems at the state and local level.

Chapter 5

Footnotes

1. The targeting provisions of the various titles and subtitles appearing in the CETA legislation should be closely related to knowledge of the characteristics of the unemployed and the economically disadvantaged. Given the fact that the officially unemployed and the economically disadvantaged are frequently quite different individuals experiencing substantively dissimilar types of employment problems, different types of programs will have to be designed to resolve their employment and earnings problems. For example, as William Barnes has noted, "the choice of target groups should depend upon programs' objectives. For example, a program which is intended to reduce cyclical swings in unemployment should be targeted on those who have lost their jobs because of an economic downtrend."

   See: Barnes, William, "Target Groups," in CETA: An Analysis of the Issues, pp. 64-104.

2. A number of the local employer surveys being conducted by CETA prime sponsors to meet the planning requirements for Title VII programs are being administered as a result of either an inability to obtain available information from existing data producers or to gaps in the existing information system. The authors' recommendations with respect to the role, design, and implementation of local employer-based surveys are presented in a later section of this chapter.

3. Several studies of CETA prime sponsor management and planning systems have found that the efficiency and effectiveness of these systems can independently influence the overall performance of the local CETA system.

   See:
   - i) Ripley, Randall B., et al., CETA Prime Sponsor Management Decisions and Program Goal Achievement, R+D Monograph 56, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978;
   - ii) Ripley, Randall B., et al., Areawide Planning in CETA, R+D Monograph 74, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

4. For a review of the data elements collected on the short forms and the long forms during the 1980 Census,

   See:
   - i) "The 1980 Census Questionnaire," American Demographics, April 1979, pp. 24-31.

ii) Herriot, Roger A. "The 1980 Census: Countdown for a Complete Count," Monthly Labor Review, September 1979, pp. 3-13.

5. These special data tabulations were published by the Manpower Administration in a series of volumes entitled Summary Manpower Indicators and Detailed Manpower Indicators. The contents of these volumes were discussed in chapter 4 of this report. The Labor Market Information Division of the Employment and Training Administration has reportedly contracted with the Lawrence-Berkeley Laboratory of the University of California to produce a similar set of reports for CETA prime sposors based upon the 1980 Census data.

6. These public use tapes would ideally contain all of the data collected from households filling out the long form. Previous public use tapes produced by the Bureau of the Census have provided state and county identifiers, but not city/town identifers essential for the production of data on a prime sponsor planning area basis. In addition, the 1970 public use tapes were based on either a 1-1000 or a 1-100 sampling basis. Sampling ratios of 1-100 or above would not allow for detailed analyses of the economically disadvantaged populations in many CETA prime sponsor and subgrantee planning areas.

7. The population projections for CETA prime sponsor planning areas for FY 80 could be compared to the findings of the 1980 Census. Comparisons of projected versus actual population would then be made for each age-sex-racial/ethnic group whose population size is projected by the LMPM model.

8. The 1980 long-form questionnaire did attempt to collect information on the number of weeks that each individual 15+ (in 1980) was unemployed during calendar year 1979 as well as the number of weeks that each such person was employed during that year. The findings on weeks of employment and unemployment an be combined to produce measures of weeks of labor force attachment for individuals during 1979.

9. See: i) National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, pp. 260-261;

ii) Stein, Robert L., "National Commission's Recommendations on Labor Force Statistics," Monthly Labor Review, April 1980, pp. 11-21.

10. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, Interim Report of the Secretary of Labor on the Recommendations of the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, p. 38.

11. As noted in more detail in chapter 4 of this report, the Geographic Profiles publications of the Bureau of Labor Statistics provide state and local data on annual average civilian labor force participation rates for only a limited number of age-sex groups (teens 16-19, men 20+, women 20+).

12. The long-form questionnaire included several questions related to the industry and occupation of the current or most recent job (back to 1975) held by each individual (15+). The information provided by respondents will be used by the Bureau of the Census to assign an industry and occupational code to those jobs.

13. It has also been suggested that data on the sex and racial composition of occupational employment be used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to project the future sex/race composition of employment. Such projections would then be used to identify specific occupational employment areas upon which public policymakers may wish to focus educational, training, and affirmative action efforts to increase access of women and minorities.

    See: i) Lecht, Leonard A., "Occupational Projections for National, State, and Local Areas," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 509-534;

    ii) Lecht, Leonard A., Occupational Choices and Training Needs: Prospects for the 1980's, Praeger Publications, New York, 1977.

14. Arnold Packer, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Policy, Evaluation, and Research, has recently argued that the Federal government should become more actively involved in the design and implementation of programs to assist in the speedy re-employment of workers displaced by plant shutdowns, including the use of retraining monies under Title II C of CETA.

    See: "Worker Protection Programs Should Help Displaced Workers Adjust, Packer Says," Employment and Training Reporter, Vol. 11, No. 24, Feb. 27, 1980, p. 686.

15. The occupation and industry data collected during the 1980 Census pertain to the current or most recent job held by respondents at the time of the survey. The earnings data pertain to calendar year 1979. It is, thus, possible that the earnings were generated by employment in occupations and industries that are different from those of the current jobs held by respondents.

16. If there are wage premiums attached to employment in particular industries, then knowledge of the local industries paying such premiums should be utilized in the job development and job placement process. Placement of graduates into occupations within such industries would increase their earned incomes, a basic goal of CETA employment and training programs. Several studies have attempted to estimate the influence of demand-side variables on the wages and earnings of workers in particular occupations.

    See: i) Wachtel, Howard M. and Betsey, C., "Employment at Low Wages," Review of Economics and Statistics, May, 1972, pp. 121-129;

ii) Sum, Andrew and Tortora, Frank, "The Determinants of Clerical Wages in Local Labor Markets: Implications for Local Employment and Training Programs," Unpublished Working Paper, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, 1975.

17. Income from all sources of public assistance is reported in one lump sum category rather than by individual source; thus, one cannot identify the particular source of public assistance income. It should be noted, however, that public assistance income tends to be substantially underreported by respondents in household surveys.

18. The 1980 Census did not utilize the concept of "household head." The method used to classify household members was based upon an initial identification of the "household member in whose name the home is owned or rented." The concept of "primary earner" can be utilized to categorize the incomes of households and families. The "primary earner" would be identified as that person whose total 1979 income was the highest of all household members.

19. A description of a state econometric model of the distribution of family incomes based upon family income data collected during the March CPS can be found in the following publication:

Treyz, George; DuGuay, G.E.; Chen, Chengkung; and Williams, Roy E.; A Regional Earned Family Income Distribution Model, Unpublished Paper, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1980.

20. An analysis of trends in the income and poverty status of families in the U.S. and New England between 1969 and 1975 can be found in the following publication:

Sum, Andrew and Mazzeo, Katherine, Trends in the Money Income and Poverty Status of Massachusetts Families, 1969-75.

21. Using available BLS data on lower living standard budgets, the Employment and Training Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor has developed household income cutoff points to be used in determining CETA eligibility within each CETA prime sponsor planning area. These designated income cutoffs points would have to be used together with the Census based income data to determine the numbers of economically disadvantaged households and persons in CETA prime sponsor planning areas.

22. These estimates are "preliminary" in the sense that they are not completely based upon the criteria actually employed in determining eligibility for participation in CETA programs. The Census income data pertain to the incomes of persons and households in the previous calendar year rather than annualized income estimates based upon the most recent three-month or six-month income and earnings experiences of applicants. In addition, the long form questionnaire did not collect information on the current duration of the unemployment spells of jobseekers at the time of the Census. As noted in previous chapters, unemployment duration data are also used in determining the eligibility of applicants for participation in Title II D and Title VI PSE programs.

23. A recommendation for an annual survey of this type was presented by Garth Mangum in his report on CETA planning needs to the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics.

See: Mangum, Garth L., "Employment and Unemployment Statistics and the CETA Prime Sponsor," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 474-490.

24. For an example of such applications of ESARS data in the CETA planning process,

See: i) Ganz, Russell, Applications of the Employment Security Automated Reporting System,...;

ii) Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Policy and Evaluation Division, Characteristics of Welfare Recipients and Other Disadvantaged Active Applicants from the ESARS System by Local DES Office Throughout the State of Massachusetts, April 1978, Boston, 1978.

25. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has continuously been involved in the publication of historical data from the CES survey on employment and earnings for states and SMSA's. The data appearing in these volumes represent annual averages and some of the data date back to 1939.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings for States and Areas, 1939-1978, Bulletin 1370-13, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

26. The procedures currently used in conducting the CES survey in states and SMSA's also should be carefully examined by the BLS and the SESA's. Particular attention should be paid to the representativeness of the current sample of establishments in the CES survey within states.

27. For an example of such uses of ES-202 employment data to assist CETA prime sponsors and public vocational education agencies in planning local employment and training programs,

See: i) Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Policy and Evaluation Division, Quarterly Industry Employment Data for Employment and Training Program Planning Purposes, by Prime Sponsor and Subgrantee Area, 1976-1978, Boston, 1979;

ii) Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Policy and Evaluation Division, Selected Growth Industries and Occupations and Public Vocational Education Completions, by Major Labor Market Areas, Boston, 1980.

28. For an example of such job development guides,

See: Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development and Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Job Development Resource Guides for the Employment and Training System, Boston, 1980.

29. For a review of the methods that can be used to provide such occupational/industry profiles to supplement the establishment listing,

See: Sum, Andrew and Mazzeo, Katherine, "An Introduction to the Job Development Resource Guides," Job Development Resource Guides for the Employment and Training System, Volume II: Occupational Staffing Patterns of Massachusetts Industries, Boston, 1980, pp. 3-10.

30. Increasing the sample size will prove effective only to the extent that it produces additional responses. In the 1977 CES Manufacturing Survey, the overall sample size nationally was 169,428 establishments, with an "eligible" sample of 148,136 establishments. Responses to the survey questionnaire were provided by 83,814 establishments yielding an overall rate of response of 56.7 percent, well below the 70 percent response rate recommended in the OES survey operations manual.

See: i) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, OES Survey Manual, (Revised), Undated.

ii) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment in Manufacturing Industries in 1977, BLS Bulletin No. 2057, March 1980.

31. Goldstein, Harold, "The New Federal-State Occupational Employment Statistics Program," Op.Cit.

32. Ibid.

33. For example, funding was provided to the BLS by the National Science Foundation to conduct a balance of nation survey designed to estimate national employment levels for detailed scientific, engineering, and technical occupations. In developing its proposal for funding, BLS agreed to expand the number of scientific, engineering, and technical job titles and definitions included on the survey form.

See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, A Proposal to Estimate Annual Employment in Scientific Engineering and Technical Occupations, Proposal to the National Science Foundation, 1977.

34. While it is not possible to assemble the vast quantity of state OES data necessary to measure the extent of the high relative error problems, our own observations suggest that this is the case. In addition, Harold Wool alluded to this problem in his report to the NCEUS. Finally, a consensus seems to exist among states cooperating in the OES that the relative errors associated with occupational estimates are extraordinarily large.

See: i) Wool, Harold, "Some Analytical Shortcomings of Occupational Data on Employed and Unemployed Workers," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 539-567;

ii) Drew, Bill, Review and Evaluation of the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) Program, Minnesota Department of Economic Security, August, 1979, p. 2.

iii) Nelson, Wendy, A Critique of the Review and Evaluation of the Occupational Emloyment Statistics (OES) Program, Maine Department of Manpower Affairs, Manpower Research Division, October 5, 1979.

iv) Cullinane, V.C., Comments on the Minnesota Review and Evaluation of the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) Program, (Letter), Arizona Department of Economic Security, October 24, 1979, p.2.

35. See: i) Aloisi, Robert, An Occupational Profile of Selected Manufacturing Industries in Massachusetts, 1977, Report No. 8, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, January 1979.

ii) McNulty, John T. and Aloisi, Robert, An Occupational Profile of Selected Non-Manufacturing Industries in Massachusetts, 1978, Report No. 9, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, January, 1980.

36. See: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment in Manufacturing, Op.Cit.

37. Writing for the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Harold Wool advanced a similar type of argument. He stated that,

> "The efforts by the BLS to provide sufficient occupational detail, by industry... has resulted in a questionable proliferation of the occupational lists - in many instances, beyond the level of any possible statistical significance."

See: Wool, Harold, "Some Analytical Shortcomings of Occupational Data on Employed and Unemployed Workers," Op.Cit., pp. 561-562.

38. An additional source of variability is centered upon relatively low levels of response. Harold Wool has argued that low rates of response may occur in part due to the response burdens associated with extensive occupational detail. Low response rates have been more prevalent in the larger industrial states.

See: Ibid., p. 562.

39. Recently, efforts have been undertaken in at least one state to more closely link ES and CETA job placement efforts through the sharing of data from the ESP system.

See: Mountain Empire Publishing Co., The Colorado Employer Information System, Report Prepared for the Colorado Division of Employment and Training and the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, September 1979, p. 3-4.

40. For a more detailed discussion of the alternative uses of local employer surveys,

See: Harrington, Paul and Sum, Andrew, CETA Planning and Private Sector Employment and Training Needs: The Role and Use of Local Employer Surveys, A Paper Prepared for the Labor Market Information Division of the Employment and Training Administration, Boston, 1980.

41. The inherent conflicts between general purpose statistical programs and the specific information needs of local data users were previously recognized by a 1960's Department of Labor task force on labor market information.

See: Advisory Committee on Research to the U.S. Employment Service, Labor Market Information and the Federal-State Employment Service, Washington, D.C., 1968.

42. Several conferences on the role and use of local employer surveys in determining private sector employment and training needs have been held in New England. These conferences were sponsored by the Center for Labor Market Studies of Northeastern University and the Massachusetts SOICC, with the cooperation of Region I Employment and Training Administration. The proceedings of these conferences appear in the following publication:

Center for Labor Market Studies and Massachusetts State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, CETA Program Planning and Private Sector Employment and Training Needs, Boston, 1980.

43. The long form questionnaire did not include questions on either the durations of current unemployment spells of workers or the reasons for their being unemployed (job leaver, job loser, etc.). As a result, one cannot determine the extent of long-term employment or the proportion of unemployment due to job loss among occupations.

44. The NCEUS did recommend that pilot studies be undertaken by several states to determine the feasibility of producing such occupational unemployment rates.

See: National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Counting the Labor Force, p. 111.

45. See: Freedman, Marcia, and Dutka, Anna, Op.Cit., p. 61.

46. For a brief review of preliminary findings on the net impacts of alternative types of CETA services,

See: Brandwein, Seymour, *Op.Cit.*

47. An overview of the follow-up activities of a number of New England prime sponsors can be found in the following publications:

Sum, Andrew, *Follow-Up Evaluation Efforts of New England Prime Sponsors*...

48. The need for such improved communications between the policymaking and data producing communities was also recognized by the NCEUS in its final report to the President and the Congress.

See: National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, *Counting the Labor Force...*

49. Case studies of CETA planning capabilities have revealed that the training qualifications, job tenure, and commitment of professional planning staff appear to be positively correlated with effective planning capabilities.

See: Ripley, Randell, B., et al., *Areawide Planning in CETA*, *Op.Cit*...

50. For a review of recent NOICC efforts in this area,

See: NOICC Information Memorandum No. 80-9: Revision of *Vocational Preparation and Occupations* and Preparation of Cross-Walks, Memorandum From Russell B. Flanders to SOICC Directors, April 4, 1980.

51. *See*: Harrington, Paul and Sum, Andrew. *CETA Planning and Private Sector Employment and Training*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abt Associates, Inc., *Evaluation of the Skills Training Improvement Program (STIP), Phase I: Starting Up*, A report prepared for the Office of Program Evaluation, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1979.

2. Adams, Arvil V. and Mangum, Garth L., *The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment*, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1978.

3. Alexander, Arthur J., "Income, Experience, and the Structure of Internal Labor Markets," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 56, (February, 1974), pp. 63-86.

4. Alexander, Arthur J., *Structure, Income, Race: A Study in Internal Labor Markets*, Santa Monica, Rand Corporation, 1970.

5. Armknecht, Paul A., "Comment on Hall and Lillien Paper," *Concepts and Data Needs*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 592-596.

6. Armknecht, Paul A., "Job Vacancies in Manufacturing, 1969-73," *Monthly Labor Review*, August, 1974, pp. 27-33.

7. Barnes, William, "Target Groups," in *CETA: An Analysis of the Issues*, National Commission for Manpower Policy, Special Report No. 23, pp. 63-104.

8. Barth, Peter, "Labor Market Operations: A Review of Research," in *Manpower Research and Labor Markets*, (Editors: Gordon L. Swanson and Jon Michaelson), Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1979.

9. Barton, Paul E., "Youth Transition to Work: The Problem and Federal Policy Setting," in *From School to Work: Improving the Transition*, National Commission for Manpower Policy, Washington, D.C., April, 1976.

10. Beckley, Nancy, "The Development and Use of ETA's Short-Term Indicators," paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor's CETA Title II Performance Measurement Conference, Arlington, Virginia, February, 1980.

11. Blaustein, Saul J., "Insured Unemployment Data," in *Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local*, pp. 197-253.

12. Bokan, Marianne; Drago, Jack; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew, *The Poor and the Unemployed in New England in 1977: Findings of the March 1977 Work Experience Survey*, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

13. Bokan, Marianne and Harrington, Paul, "Preliminary Findings of the Pilot Job Openings Survey in Massachusetts," in *Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning and Evaluation*, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, March, 1980, pp. 339-392.

14. Bokan, Marianne; Harrington, Paul; and Stuniolo, Louis, *A Preliminary Report on Response and Non-Response in the First Round of the Massachusetts Job Openings Survey Pilot Project*, Pilot Job Openings Survey Research Report Number Eight, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, September, 1979.

15. Borus, Michael E., "Data Needed to Measure the Impact of Public Programs," *Concepts and Data Needs*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1979, pp. 471-503.

16. Borus, Michael, E., *Measuring the Impact of Employment-Related Social Programs*, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1979.

17. Bouba, Maryann and Sum, Andrew, *The Extent of Job Desires of Persons Outside of the Labor Force in the United States and Massachusetts: Implications for Targetting CETA-Related Employment and Training Resources*, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

18. Bouba, Maryann and Sum, Andrew, *Targetting CETA Resources: An Analysis of the Demographic and Labor Force Characteristics of Massachusetts Family Heads Potentially Eligible for CETA-Related Employment and Training Programs*, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, September, 1979.

19. Bowers, Norman, "Young and Marginal: An Overview of Youth Employment," *Monthly Labor Review*, October, 1979, pp. 4-18.

20. Brady, Elaine, *An Evaluation of the Women in Construction Project of the Massachusetts Balance of State Prime Sponsor*, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, 1980.

21. Brandwein, Seymour, "Long-Term DOL Performance Measurement," Paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor Conference on CETA Title II Performance Measurement, Virginia, February, 1980.

22. Bregger, John E., "A New Employment Statistics Review Commission," *Monthly Labor Review*, March, 1977, pp. 14-20.

23. Briggs, Vernon M., "Comments on the Luther Tweeten Paper," in *Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 561-63.

24. Briggs, Vernon, "Special Labor Market Segments," in *Manpower Research and Labor Economics*, (Editors: Gordon I. Swanson and Jon Michaelson), pp. 243-226.

25. Buckley, John E., "Do Area Wages Reflect Area Living Costs?" *Monthly Labor Review*, September, 1979, pp. 24-29.

26. Cain, Glen G., "Labor Force Concepts and Definitions in View of Their Purposes," Concepts and Data Needs, U.S. Government Printing Office Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 3-45.

27. Camil Associates, Recruitment, Job Search, and the United States Employment Service, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, R&D Monograph 43, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

28. Carey, Max L., "Revised Occupational Projections to 1985," Monthly Labor Review, November, 1976, pp. 10-22.

29. Chamber of Commerce of the Greater Portland Region, Wage and Salary Survey 1979, Personnel Management Association, Chamber of Commerce of the Greater Portland Region, 1979.

30. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, The New Private Sector Initiatives Program, Washington, D.C., 1979.

31. Christy, P.T. and Horowitz, K.J., "Evaluations of BLS Projections of 1975 Output and Employment," Monthly Labor Review, August, 1979, pp. 8-19.

32. Cleary, Paul and Sum, Andrew, Job Search Behavior, Job and Training Desires, and Reservation Wages of the Insured Unemployed in Lowell, Massachusetts, Policy and Evaluation Division, Department of Manpower Development, Boston, May, 1980.

33. Cohen, Malcolm S., "ESP: A New Source of Labor Market Information," Paper presented to the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Ann Arbor, October, 1978.

34. Cohen, Malcolm S. and Schwartz, Arthur R., "Estimates of State New Hires Rates," in Proceedings of the Employment Service Potential Conference Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan-Wayne State University, Ann Arbor, 1978.

35. Cohen, Robert, 'New Careers' Grows Older: A Perspective on the Paraprofessional Experience, 1965-1975, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1976.

36. Coleman, Edwin J. and Goodman, Jeanne S., "Comments on the Wolfbein Report," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 81-84.

37. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Employment Review, October, 1979, p. 3.

38. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed: August 1976, Boston, 1976.

39. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Characteristics of Applicants Registered in Employment Service Offices and Selected Employment Services Activities, Massachusetts: Cumulative October 1978 Through September 1979, Boston, 1979.

40. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Characteristics of Applicants Registered in Employment Service Offices and Selected Employment Service Activities, Massachusetts: Cumulative October 1979 Through March 1980, Boston, 1980.

41. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Employment and Wages in Cities and Towns, 1967-1978, Boston, 1979.

42. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Employment and Wages in Massachusetts and the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, 1970-1974, Boston, 1975.

43. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, A Monthly Survey of Unfilled Job Openings: Boston-Metro, Springfield, Worcester, Lawrence, Taunton Job Banks-June 1977, Boston, 1977.

44. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Guide to the Use of ESARS: The Employment Security Automated Reporting System, Boston, 1976.

45. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Occupational Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed in Massachusetts July-December 1978, Boston, 1979.

46. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Division of Employment Security, Employment Requirements by Occupation, by Industry 1976-1985, Boston, 1979.

47. Congressional Budget Office, The Teenage Unemployment Problem: What Are the Options?, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

48. Coopers and Lybrand, Massachusetts High Technology Council Inc., Results of A Survey on Human Resource Needs, Boston, January, 1980.

49. Current Population Survey, March 1979 Technical Documentation, prepared by Data Access and Use Staff, Data User Services Division, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 1980.

50. Davidson, Roger H., The Politics of Comprehensive Manpower Legislation, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1972.

51. Dempsey, Richard, "The Bureau of Labor Statistics Employment Projections Program" in Occupational Employment Projections for Program Planning Purposes: Issues and Examples, (Editor: David W. Stevens), Human Resources Research Program, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1976.

52. Devine, Eugene, Analysis of Manpower Shortages in Local Government, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1970.

53. Doeringer, Peter B., "Comments on the Glen Cain Paper," Concepts and Data Needs, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 46-51.

54. Doeringer, Peter B., et al., Low-Income Labor Markets and Urban Manpower Programs: A Critical Assessment, Research and Development Findings No. 12, U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Washington, D.C., 1972.

55. Doeringer, Peter B. and Piore, Michael J., Internal Labor Markets and Manpower Analysis, D.C. Heath, Lexington, 1971.

56. Dooley, Patricia and Harrington, Paul, Expansion of the Labor Turnover Survey Sample Under the Massachusetts Job Openings Pilot Survey Project, Massachusetts Pilot Job Openings Survey, Research Paper Number Six, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, August, 1979.

57. Dorrer, John, "Performance Measurement Issues: A Prime Sponsor Perspective," paper presented to the U.S. Department of Labor's CETA Title II Performance Measurement Conference, Arlington, Virginia, February, 1980.

58. Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew; CETA Planning Package for Connecticut: Findings from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

59. Drago, Jack; Ganz, Russ; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew; CETA Planning Package for Massachusetts: Findings from the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

60. Drewes, D.W. and Katz, D.S., Manpower Data and Vocational Education: A National Study of Availability and Use, North Carolina State University, Center for Occupational Education, Raleigh, 1975.

61. Dunlop, John T., "Job Vacancy Measures and Economic Analysis," The Measurement and Interpretation of Job Vacancies, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1966.

62. Dunlop, John T. and Mills, Daniel Q., Manpower Development and Utilization in the Contract Construction Industry, Harvard University, Cambridge, 1971.

63. Duscha, Julius, "Employment Statistics and the Congress," in Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, pp. 392-409, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 393-409.

64. Eck, Alan, Measuring Labor Force Movements: A New Approach, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Report 581, Washington, D.C., 1980.

65. Ehrenhalt, Samuel, "Comments on the Wolfbein Paper," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

66. Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, New England Economic Indicators, November 1979, Boston, 1979.

67. Finegan, T. Aldrich, "The Measurement, Behavior, and Classification of Discouraged Workers," Concepts and Data Needs, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

68. Fishkind, Henry and Roberts, R. Blaine, "Two Methods of Projecting Occupational Employment," Monthly Labor Review, May, 1978.

69. Flaim, Paul O., "Discouraged Workers and Changes in Unemployment," Monthly Labor Review, March, 1973, pp. 8-16.

70. Flaim, Paul O. and Fullerton, Howard N., "Labor Force Projections to 1990: Three Possible Paths," Employment Projections for the 1980's, BLS Bulletin 2030, pp. 1-11.

71. Folk, Hugh, The Shortage of Scientists and Engineers, D.C. Heath and Co., Lexington, 1970.

72. Franke, Walter and Sobel, Irving, The Shortage of Skilled and Technical Workers, Heath-Lexington Books, Lexington, Mass., 1970.

73. Freedman, Marcia and Dutka, Anna, Training Information for Policy Guidance, Employment and Training Administration, R&D Monograph 76, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1980.

74. Frumerman, Harry, Job Vacancy Statistics in the United States, Background Paper No. 3, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1979.

75. Ganz, Russell, Applications of the Employment Security Automated Reporting System (ESARS) for Targetting CETA Resources at the Local Level, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1979.

76. Ganz, Russell, The Structure of Unemployment Rates by Major Occupational Category for the United States, Massachusetts, and the Other Ten Largest States, 1976 and 1977, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

77. Ganz, Russell and Sum, Andrew, The Role of Unemployment Insurance Based Data Sources in Planning Employment and Training Programs, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

78. Ginzberg, Eli, "The Job Problem," Scientific American, Vol. 237, No. 5, November, 1977, pp. 43-51.

79. Ginzberg, Eli, "The Scope for Structural Policies in Achieving Full Employment: A North American Perspective," *Structural Determinants of Employment and Unemployment*, Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, Paris, 1977.

80. Goldberg, Steve; Schneider, Glen; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey; *Data Collection Materials for Follow-up Evaluations of Title II B Adult Programs*, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, January, 1979.

81. Goldstein, Harold, "The New Federal-State Occupational Employment Statistics Program," *Monthly Labor Review*, October, 1971, pp. 12-17.

82. Goldstein, Harold, "State and Local Labor Force Statistics," *Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local*, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1980, pp. 412-464.

83. Goldstein, Harold M. and Horowitz, Morris, A., *Entry-Level Health Occupations: Development and Future*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1977.

84. Graf, Bruce, *Proposed Methodologies for OES Survey Area Occupational/Employment Estimates*, Draft report, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., undated.

85. Green, Gloria P., "Comparing Total and State - Insured Unemployment," *Monthly Labor Review*, June, 1971, pp. 37-48.

86. Hall, Robert, "Comments on Frumerman's Report," in *Job Vacancy Statistics in the United States*, NCEUS Background Paper Number 3, Washington, D.C., May, 1978.

87. Hall, Robert E., and Lillien, David M., "The Measurement and Significance of Labor Turnover," *Concepts and Data Needs*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 578-592.

88. Hansen, Morris H.; Hurwitz, William N.; and Madow, William G., *Sample Survey Methods and Theory Volume 1: Methods and Application*, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1966.

89. Hardiman, Phil and Siebert, Glen, *First Progress Report on the Employment Service Potential Project*, Report to Region IX Employment and Training Administration, Sacramento, June, 1976.

90. Harrington, Paul, *The Labor Department's Experience in the Collection and Analysis of Job Vacancy Statistics: The Experimental Programs of 1964-1966*, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, 1980.

91. Harrington, Paul and Bokan, Marianne, Preliminary Findings of the Massachusetts Pilot Job Openings Survey Project, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, September, 1979.

92. Harrington, Paul; Herrnstadt, Irwin; Meehan, Edward; and Sum, Andrew, (Editors), Issues Related to the Development and Use of Employer Surveys at the Local Level, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, 1980.

93. Harrington, Paul and McLaughlin, Francis, Implementation of the Skills Training Improvement Program: Training Electronic Test Technicians in the Medford Sub-Grantee Area, Research Report Prepared for the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, March, 1980.

94. Harrington, Paul and McLaughlin, Francis, The Planning, Design, and Implementation of the STIP I Program: The Experience of the Massachusetts Balance of State Prime Sponsor, Research Report Prepared for the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Forthcoming, 1980.

95. Harrington, Paul and Sum, Andrew, An Overview of the Pilot Job Openings Survey in Massachusetts, Pilot Job Openings Survey Research Report Number One, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, September, 1979.

96. Harrington, Paul and Sum, Andrew, Unemployment in Massachusetts: A Critical Assessment of Its Nature and Causes, Massachusetts Senate No. 2050, Boston, September, 1975.

97. Harrington, Paul and Sturniolo, Louis, Findings of the JOS Response Analysis Survey, Pilot Job Openings Survey Research Report Number Thirteen, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, September 1979.

98. Harrison, Bennett; Kelley, Maryellen; Shkilnyk, Anastasia; and Sum, Andrew; A Manual for CETA Prime Sponsors on the Monitoring and Evaluation of Title One Programs for Employment and Training, Second Edition, National Civil Service League, Washington, D.C., 1976.

99. Harrison, Bennett and Sum, Andrew, "The Theory of 'Dual' or 'Segmented' Labor Markets," Journal of Economic Issues, September, 1979, pp. 687-706.

100. Harrison, Bennett, Education, Training, and the Urban Ghetto, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1972.

101. Harrison, Bennett and Sum, Andrew, Labor Market Data Needs from the Perspective of 'Dual' or 'Segmented' Labor Market Research, Background Paper No. 29, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1979.

102. Hedges, Janice Neipert and Gallogly, Steven J., "Full and Part-time: A Review of Definitions," Monthly Labor Review, March, 1977, pp. 21-28.

103. Henle, Peter, "Exploring the Distribution of Earned Income," Monthly Labor Review, December, 1972, pp. 16-27.

104. Henle, Peter and Ryscavage, Paul, "The Distribution of Earnings Among Men and Women," Monthly Labor Review, April, 1980, pp. 3-10.

105. Herriot, Roger A., "The 1980 Census: A Countdown for a Complete Count," Monthly Labor Review, September, 1979, pp. 3-13.

106. Hickey, Joseph A., "Unemployment Insurance Covers Additional 9 Million Workers," Monthly Labor Review, July, 1978, pp. 14-17.

107. Holt, Charles C., and David, Martin H., "The Concept of Job Vacancies in a Dynamic Theory of the Labor Market," The Measurement and Interpretation of Job Vacancy Statistics, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1966.

108. Horowitz, Morris and Herrnstadt, Irwin, The Training of Tool and Die Makers, Northeastern University, Boston, 1969.

109. Hudson-Wilson, Susan and Wheeler, David, State Employment Forecasts: An Evaluation of the BLS System, Boston University, Boston, 1977.

110. Johnson, Miriam; Sugarman, Marge; and Walsh, John; Help Wanted: Case Studies of Classified Ads, Olympus Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1975.

111. Joseph, Myron, "Job Vacancy Measurement," The Journal of Human Resources, Fall, 1966, pp. 59-80.

112. Kaitz, yuman B., "Analyzing the Length of Spells of Unemployment," Monthly Labor Review Reader, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Bulletin 1868, 1975, pp. 36-45.

113. Kassander, A. Richard, and Taylor, Carol, Technical Proposal in Response to RFP ETA/OPER 7602-4: A Local Labor Market Econometric Forecasting Model, University of Arizona, May 14, 1976.

114. Kazarian, Robert; Sum, Andrew; and Sawhney, P.K.. Data Sources on Enrollments in and Completions from Public Vocational Education Programs in the Boston Metropolitan Area, A Report Prepared for the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Industry/Occupation Research Department, Boston, 1977.

115. Kennedy, Kim; Mazzeo, Katherine; and Winkeller, Rachel, Part-Time Employment in Massachusetts: Implications for Employment and Training Policy, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, October, 1979.

116. Kerr, Clark, "The Balkanization of Labor Markets," Readings in Labor Force Economics and Labor Relations (2nd Edition), (Editors: Lloyd J. Reynolds et al.), Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1978.

117. Keith, Kenneth, "The Employment Service Potential Project: Fiscal Years 1977-79 and Beyond," in *ESP: Proceedings of the Employment Service Potential Meetings*, pp. 17-28.

118. King, Christopher; Harkins, William H; and Geraci, Vincent J., *CETA Title II Performance Measurement Issues*, Paper Presented to the U.S. Department of Labor Conference on CETA Title II Performance Indicators, Virginia, February, 1980.

119. Kleiner, Morris M., "An Appraisal of New Data Sources for State and Area Estimates," *Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 99-126.

120. Konstant, Raymond and Wingeard, F.O., "Analysis and Use of Job Vacancy Statistics," *Monthly Labor Review*, August, 1968, pp. 22-31.

121. LeCam, Christine, *The Role of Institutional Supply Data in the Development of an Occupational Information System*, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, October, 1979.

122. LeCam, Christine and Sum, Andrew, *A Description of the Methodologies and Data Sources Used in Constructing the Preliminary Occupational Demand-Supply Table for the State of Massachusetts*, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, February, 1978.

123. Lecht, Leonard A., "Occupational Projections for National, State, and Local Areas," *Concepts and Data Needs*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 509-534.

124. Lecht, Leonard A., *Priorities for Planning in Vocational Education: Alternatives for the 1970's*, National Planning Association, Washington, D.C., 1975.

125. Levine, Robert A., *The Poor Ye Need Not Have With You: Lessons from the War on Poverty*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1970.

126. Levitan, Sar A., *The Great Society's Poor Law: A New Approach to Poverty*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1969.

127. Levitan, Sar A. and Johnston, Benjamin, *The Job Corps: A Social Experiment That Works*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1975.

128. Levitan, Sar A.; Mangum, Garth L.; and Taggart, Robert III, *Economic Opportunity in the Ghetto: The Partnership of Government and Business*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1970.

129. Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert J., "Do Our Statistics Measure the Real Labor Market Hardships?," A Paper Presented to the American Statistical Association Annual Meeting, Boston, August, 1976.

130. Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert III, *Employment and Earnings Inadequacy: A New Social Indicator*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1974.

131. Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert, *The Promise of Greatness*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1976.

132. Levitan, Sar A. and Taggart, Robert (Editors), *The Emergency Employment Act: The PEP Generation*, Olympus Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1974.

133. Lynton, Edith T.; Seldin, Joel R.; and Gruhin, Sarah, *Employer's Views on Hiring and Training: A Non-Statistical Approach to Data-Gathering*, Labor Market Information Network, New York, 1978.

134. Maine Department of Manpower Affairs, Manpower Research Division, *Fiscal 1979 Annual Planning Information: Kennebec County*, Augusta, 1978.

135. Maine Department of Manpower Affairs, Manpower Research Division, *1978 Maine Occupational Wages in Manufacturing Industries*, Augusta, 1979.

136. Mangum, Garth L., *The Emergence of Manpower Policy*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1969.

137. Mangum, Garth L., *MDTA: Foundation of Federal Manpower Policy*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1968.

138. Mangum, Garth L., "Employment and Unemployment Statistics and the CETA Prime Sponsor," *Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 474-489.

139. Mangum, Garth L.; Morlock, James; Pines, Marion; and Snedecker, David, *Job Market Futurity*, Olympus Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1979.

140. Mangum, Garth L. and Robson, R. Thayne, (Editors), *Metropolitan Impact of Manpower Programs: A Four City Comparison*, Olympus Publishing Co., Salt Lake City, 1973.

141. Mangum, Garth L. and Walsh, John, *A Decade of Manpower Development and Training*, Olympus Publishing Company, Salt Lake City, 1973.

142. Mangum, Garth L. and Walsh, John, *Employment and Training Programs for Youth: What Works Best for Whom?*, National Council on Employment Policy, Washington, D.C., 1978.

143. Manpower Research Division, Maine Department of Employment Security, *Maine Occupational Outlook to 1985*, Augusta, February, 1977.

144. Marshall, Ray, "Implications of Labor Market Theory for Employment Policy," in *Manpower Research and Labor Economics*, (Editors: Swanson and Michaelson) Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, 1979, p. 40.

145. Marshall, Ray; Glover, Robert W.; and Franklin, William S., Training and Entry into Union Construction, Manpower R&D Monograph 39, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975.

146. Marshall, Ray and Perlman, Richard (eds.), An Anthology of Labor Economics, New York, Wiley, 1972.

147. Martin, Philip L., "Comments on the Luther Tweeten Paper," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 563-66.

148. Martin, Rob, Projecting the Demand for Labor in Massachusetts, Draft Report of the Massachusetts Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, 1980.

149. Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Balance of State Prime Sponsor, "Skill Training Improvement Program (STIP) Grant Application," Boston, October, 1977.

150. Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Manpower Data Packages for Planning Employment and Training Programs Based Upon the 1976 Survey of Income and Education, Boston, June, 1978.

151. Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Selected Characteristics of U.I. Claimants, December-January 1978, by Prime Sponsor and Subgrantee Area, Boston, June, 1978.

152. Mazzeo, Katherine and Sum, Andrew, An Analysis of Hiring Standards and Wage Policies of Firms Employing Workers in Fifteen High Net Demand Occupations in the Boston Metropolitan Area, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

153. Mazzeo, Katherine and Sum, Andrew, An Analysis of On-the-Job Training, Promotion Opportunities, and Job Vacancies in the Fifteen High Net Demand Occupations, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

154. Mazzeo, Katherine and Sum, Andrew, An Analysis of the Sources of Labor Supply and Labor Recruitment Methods of Firms Employing Workers in Fifteen High Net Demand Occupations in the Boston Metropolitan Area, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

155. McCarthy, Philip J., "Some Sources of Error in Labor Force Estimates from the Current Population Survey," in Data Collection, Processing, and Presentation: National and Local, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 1-39.

156. McLaughlin, Francis M., "CETA and the Private Sector: The Skills Training Improvement Program in Massachusetts," in Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, March, 1980.

157. McLaughlin, Francis and Harrington, Paul, A Process Evaluation of the Implementation of the Skills Training Improvement Program in Gardner Massachusetts, Research Report Prepared for the Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, February, 1980.

158. McLaughlin, Maureen and Sum, Andrew, Interrelationship Between Unemployment and Poverty in Massachusetts: Implications on State Employment and Training Policy, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

159. Meisner, Charlotte and Rico, Susan, Variety and Distribution of Occupations in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, March, 1980.

160. Meehan, Edward; Sum, Andrew and Sawhney, P.K., A Review and Critique of Alternative Methodologies for Estimating Labor Supply in Various Occupational Areas Within State and Local Labor Markets, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, September, 1976.

161. Memorandum from Russell B. Flanders to SOICC Directors, Confidentiality of Data, National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, February 14, 1980.

162. Memorandum from John W. Gracza to State Employment Security Administrators and Regional Commissioners, Bureau of Labor Statistics, State and Area Projections Program: Economic Base Analysis, May 30, 1978.

163. Memorandum from John W. Gracza to State Employment Security Agencies and Regional Commissioners, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Background Material for the OES Matrix/Projection Program, January 31, 1977.

164. Memorandum from Ronald E. Kutscher to All Regional Commissioners, Confidentiality of OES Survey Matrix Data, Bureau of Labor Statistics, February 15, 1980.

165. Memorandum from Region I BLS Commissioner Wendell D. MacDonald to New England State Employment Security Agencies, OES Survey Publication Criteria, December 6, 1977.

166. Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Occupational New Hires Study: The First Two Years, St. Paul, September, 1979.

167. Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, CETA: Manpower Programs Under Local Control, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1978.

168. Mirengoff, William and Rindler, Lester, The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Impact on People, Places, Programs, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1976.

169. Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; and Greenspan, Harry J., *Expanding Public Service Employment Under CETA: Preliminary Assessment*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1978.

170. Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; Greenspan, Harry J.; and Seablom, Scott; *CETA: Assessment of Public Service Employment Programs*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1979.

171. Mirengoff, William; Rindler, Lester; Greenspan, Harry; Seablom, Scott; and Black, Lois, *The New CETA: Effect on Public Service Employment Programs, A Preliminary Report*, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., September, 1979.

172. Moore, Geoffrey H., *Improving the Presentation of Employment and Unemployment Statistics*, NCEUS Background Paper Number 22, U.S. Government Printing Office, Wasington, D.C., August, 1978.

173. Murphy, Martin and McDonough, Carol, *An Inventory of the Labor Market Supply Generated by Secondary and Post-Secondary Non-Professional Educational Institutions Within Massachusetts*, University of Lowell, Department of Economics, September, 1977.

174. Myers, Charles A., *The Role of the Private Sector in Manpower Development*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1971.

175. National Center for Educational Statistics, *Earned Degrees Conferred: 1973-74*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

176. National Center for Educational Statistics, *Standard Terminology for Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970.

177. National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, *Counting the Labor Force*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

178. National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, *A Classification of Instructional Systems*, Prepared for the National Center for Educational Statistics, Boulder, 1980.

179. National Commission for Manpower Policy, *CETA: An Analysis of the Issues*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

180. National Commission for Manpower Policy, *Job Creation Through Public Service Employment, Volume II: Monitoring the Public Service Employment Program*, Report No. 6, Washington, D.C., 1978.

181. National Commission for Manpower Policy, *Monitoring the Public Service Employment Program: The Second Round*, Special Report No. 32, Washington, D.C., March, 1979.

182. National Commission for Manpower Policy Staff Report, "Corporate Hiring Practices," in *From School to Work: Improving the Transition*, pp. 37-55.

183. National Council on Employment Policy, Initial Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) Experience at the Local Level, Report No. 1, Washington, D.C., February, 1978.

184. National Council on Employment Policy, The Unfolding Youth Initiatives: Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Projects Act (YEDPA), Report No. 2, Washington, D.C., August, 1978.

185. National Council on Employment Policy, The Local Focus on Youth: A Review of Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstrations Projects Act (Report No. 3 in a series), Washington, D.C., March, 1979.

186. National Manpower Policy Task Force, The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Opportunities and Challenges, Washington, D.C., April, 1974.

187. Neary, H. James, "The BLS Pilot Survey of Training in Industry," Monthly Labor Review, February, 1974, pp. 26-32.

188. Nelson, Barbara and Dailey, Martha, Annual Planning Information Report, Fiscal Year 1979, Boston, Massachusetts Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, 1978.

189. Nevada Employment Security Department, Progress Report: Employment Service Potential Project, Carson City, Nevada, June 15, 1976.

190. New York Department of Labor, Division of Research and Statistics, Technical and Manpower in New York State, 2 Volumes, Albany, 1964.

191. Norwood Janet, Some Social Aspects of Unemployment, Report 469, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1976.

192. Office of Manpower and Employment Statistics, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Statement on the Occupational Employment Statistics Program, Washington, D.C., August, 1971.

193. Ohio State University Research Foundation, A Formative Evaluation of the Private Sector Initiative Program, Report No. 1, Prepared for the Office of Program Evaluation, Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Columbus, 1979.

194. Oi, Walter Y., "Labor as a Quasi-fixed Factor," The Journal of Political Economy, Vol. LXX, No. 6, December 1962, pp. 538-555.

195. O'Keefe, Patrick, "Program Information Systems," in CETA: An Analysis of the Issues, pp. 185-215.

196. Perlman, Richard, "Comments on Harry Frumerman's Paper," Concepts and Data Needs, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 638-640.

197. Personick, Valerie A. and Sylvester, Robert A., "Evaluation of BLS 1970 Economic and Employment Projections," *Monthly Labor Review*, August, 1976, pp. 13-26.

198. Pines, Marion, "Comments on the Garth Mangum Paper," *Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 490-492.

199. Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, *Quarterly Industry Employment Data for Employment and Training Program Planning Purposes, by Prime Sponsor and Subgrantee Area, 1976-78*, Boston, 1979.

200. Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, *Quarterly Industry Employment Data for Employment and Training Program Planning Purposes, Major Labor Market Areas, 1975-1978*, Boston, 1979.

201. Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, *Selected Growth Industries, Occupations, and Public Vocational Education Completions, by Major Labor Market Area*, Boston, January, 1980.

202. Preston, Noreen, *The Help-Wanted Index: Technical Description and Behavioral Trends*, The Conference Board, New York, 1977.

203. Rieg, Mary K., "Pay Factors Displayed in Dress Manufacturing," *Monthly Labor Review*, April, 1979, pp. 54-56.

204. Ripley, Randall B., *Areawide Planning in CETA*, Employment and Training Administration R&D Monograph 74, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

205. Rosenthal, Neil; Harrington, Paul; Sommers, Dixie; and Terlizzi, Lois, *Issues Underlying the Development of Job Vacancy Statistics*, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., August, 1977.

206. Rowan, Ruth, *Meeting State and Area Occupational Information Needs: The Industry-Occupational Matrix System*, A report prepared for the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, 1976.

207. Ruttenberg, Stanley H. and Gutchess, Jocelyn, *Manpower Challenge of the 1970's: Institutions and Social Change*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1970.

208. Schiller, Bradley R., "Equality, Opportunity, and the 'Good Job'," *The Public Interest*, Spring 1976, pp. 111-120.

209. Schiller, Bradley R., "Relative Earnings Mobility in the United States," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 67, No. 5, December, 1977, pp. 926-940.

210. Schwenk, Albert E. and Personick, Martin E., "Analyzing Earnings Differentials in Industry Wage Surveys," *Monthly Labor Review*, June, 1974, pp. 56-59.

211. Scoville, James G., "Comments on the Harold Wool Paper," Concepts and Data Needs, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 568-570.

212. Scoville, James G., Manpower and Occupational Analysis: Concepts and Measurement, D.C. Heath & Co., Lexington, Mass., 1972.

213. Sharir, Shumuel, "On the Relationship Between Durations, Flows and Stocks of Unemployment and Vacancies: A Comment," The Journal of Human Resources, Fall 1971, pp. 528-532.

214. Shea, John R., "Occupational Education and Training Requirements: Relationships Essential for Planning State Vocational Education," in Manpower Information for Vocational Education Planning, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, 1969.

215. Shiskin, Julius, "Employment and Unemployment: The Doughnut or the Hole?," Monthly Labor Review, February, 1976, pp. 3-10.

216. Soloman, H., Manpower Needs in Health Services, New York State Department of Labor, Albany, 1969.

217. Solow, Robert, The Nature and Sources of Unemployment in the United States, Almquist, Stockholm, 1969.

218. Sommers, Dixie, "Occupational Supply Information and Planning for Education and Training," Paper Presented to the North American Conference on Labor Statistics, Ottawa, Canada, July, 1976.

219. Sommers, Dixie and Cohen, Carin, "New Occupational Rates of Labor Force Separation," in Monthly Labor Review, March, 1980, pp. 36-40.

220. Sommers, Dixie and Eck, Alan, "Occupational Mobility in the American Labor Force," Monthly Labor Review, July, 1977, pp. 18-24.

221. South Carolina Employment Security Commission, Job Guide for Entry Occupations in South Carolina, Columbia, 1979.

222. South Carolina Employment Security Commission, South Carolina Occupational Training Needs: A Demand and Supply Study for CETA Title I: South Carolina, Columbia, 1977.

223. State of California, Employment Development Department, Employment and Data Research, Employment Service Potential: Volume I, The Dimensions of Labor Turnovers, Sacramento, 1979.

224. State of California, Employment Development Department, Employment Data and Research, Employment Service Potential: Special Survey of Employers Volume III, Sacramento, September, 1979.

225. State of Vermont, Department of Employment Security, Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed: Vermont and Its Labor Market Areas, Montpelier, March, 1980.

226. State of Vermont, Department of Employment Security, Characteristics of the Insured Unemployed: Vermont and Its Labor Market Areas, March 1980, 1980.

227. State of Vermont, Department of Employment Security, Quarterly Report of Job Openings Received by Occupation and Wage Rate in Vermont's Twelve Labor Market Areas, Montpelier, 1979.

228. Steller, Mary Ellen and Maloy, Peter, Population and Labor Force Projections for Massachusetts, Labor Area Research, Massachusetts Division of Employment Security, Boston, 1980.

229. Stelluto, George L., "Federal Pay Comparability: Facts to Temper the Debate," Monthly Labor Review, June, 1979, pp. 18-28.

230. Stevens, David W., Employment Projections for Planning Vocational-Technical Education Curricula: Mission Impossible?, Human Resources Research Program, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1976.

231. Stevens, David W., "Planning Training Programs in the Absence of Labor Market Control," A Paper Prepared for the National Council on Employment Policy, Washington, D.C., 1978.

232. Stevens, David W., "Performance Measurement in the CETA System," CETA: An Analysis of the Issues, Special Report No. 2., National Commission for Manpower Policy, May, 1978.

233. Sturniolo, Luis, Issues Related to the Collection and Utilization of Help-Wanted Advertising Information, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Policy and Evaluation Division, Boston, December, 1979.

234. Sum, Andrew, The Basic Components of the Planning and Evaluation Functions for CETA Title One Programs at the State and Local Level, A Report Presented to the Employment and Training Administration, Boston, March, 1977.

235. Sum, Andrew, "Follow-Up Evaluation Activities of New England CETA Prime Sponsors," A Paper Presented to the U.S. Department of Labor Conference on CETA Title II Performance Measures, Virginia, February, 1980.

236. Sum, Andrew M., "Issues Related to the Purposes, Collection, Analysis, and Interpretation of Job Vacancy Data," Proceedings of the Bureau of Labor Statistics Job Vacancy Statistics Conference, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., August, 1978.

237. Sum, Andrew, Labor Market Information Inputs for Local Manpower Planning and Evaluation, Northeastern University, 1976.

238. Sum, Andrew M., Labor Market Information from A User's Perspective: Data Inputs for CETA Planning Purposes, Research Report submitted to Region I Employment and Training Administration, 1977.

239. Sum, Andrew M., "Women in the Labor Force: Why Projections Have Been Too Low," *Monthly Labor Review*, July, 1977, pp. 18-25.

240. Sum, Andrew M. and Ewer, David, "A Comparative Analysis of Selected Occupational Staffing Pattern Data from the 1970 Census and the OES Surveys in Massachusetts," unpublished Working Paper, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, 1977.

241. Sum, Andrew; Ganz, Russell; Harrington, Paul; and Burns Susan, *An Overview of the Organizational Structure and Operations of PSIP Programs in New England*, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1980.

242. Sum, Andrew; Harrington, Paul; Schneider, Glen; et al., *Findings of the Prime Sponsors FY 78 Year End Reports on YEDPA Program Operations*, A Report Prepared for the Office of Youth Programs, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1980.

243. Sum, Andrew and Leicher, Susan, *Recruiting, Training, and Retraining the Disadvantaged Worker: The NAB JOBS Training Program Experience Within Harvard University, 1970-74*, Cambridge, 1975.

244. Sum, Andrew and Mazzeo, Katherine, *Job Development Resource Guides for the Employment and Training System*, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, November, 1979.

245. Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey, *Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training Programs at the Local Level, Volume I: The Role of Program Evaluation at the Local Level*, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Boston, 1978.

246. Sum, Andrew; Mazzeo, Katherine; McLaughlin, Francis; and Zornitsky, Jeffrey, *Evaluating the Performance of Employment and Training Programs at the Local Level, Volume II: The Use of Process, Outcome, and Benefit-Cost Evaluation Techniques*, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Boston, 1978.

247. Sum, Andrew; Meehan Edward M.; and Drago, Jack, *Trends in the Labor Force Status of Youth in New England: Implications for Targetting Youth Employment and Training*, Center for Labor Market Studies, Northeastern University, Boston, 1979.

248. Sum, Andrew; Meehan, Edward; and Ganz, Russell, "The Economically Disadvantaged in New England: Implications for Targetting CETA Resources," *The New England Journal of Employment and Training*, April, 1980.

249. Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; and Mazzeo, Katherine, *An Introduction to the Role of Occupational Information Systems: The Objectives of the Labor Supply Study*, Submitted to the Division of Employment Security, Occupational/Industry Research Department, February, 1978.

250. Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; and Herrnstadt, Irwin, Issues in the Development of a Comprehensive Occupational Information System for Planning Employment and Training Programs at the State and Local Level: Current Research Efforts Within the State of Massachusetts, Research and Program Development, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development and the Department of Economics, Northeastern University, October, 1977.

251. Sum, Andrew; Sawhney, P.K.; Jantzen, Robert; and Vinson, Robert, The Distribution of Establishments by Employment Size-Class Within Covered Industries in the Boston SMSA During 1975, DES Labor Supply Project: Working Paper Number Ten, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, 1976.

252. Sum, Andrew, Sawhney, P.K.; Meehan, Edward; Tortora, Frank; and Harrington, Charles, Sources and Uses of Local Labor Market Information for CETA Title One Program Planning Purposes, Northeastern University, Department of Economics, Boston, 1977.

253. Sum, Andrew and Winer, Elliot, Employment and Income Development in Massachusetts, 1974-77, Research and Program Development Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Boston, 1978.

254. Sundquist, James L. (Editor), On Fighting Poverty, Basic Books, New York, 1969.

255. Swerdloff, Sol, "Comments on the Paper by Harold Wool," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 571-75.

256. Taggart, Robert (Editor), Job Creation: What Works?, Olympus Publishing Company, Salt Lake City, 1977.

257. Tarr, James R. and Campbell, Timothy A., Florida's Occupational Information and Delivery System, Office of Manpower Planning, Florida Department of Community Affairs, Tallahassee, October, 1976.

258. Teper, Lazare, "Comments on the Paper of Harry Frumerman," Job Vacancy Statistics in the United States, Background Paper No. 3, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., May 1978, pp. 66-71.

259. "The 1980 Census Questionnaire," American Demographics, Vol. 1, No. 4, April, 1979, pp. 25-31.

260. Treyz, George I., An Overview of the Massachusetts Economic Policy Analysis (MEPA) Model and Its Use from 1977 through 1980, Paper presented for an assessment of the State of the Art in Regional Modeling, Cambridge, April, 1980.

261. Treyz, George I., Predicting the Economic Effects of State Policy Initiatives, Department of Economics, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, undated.

262. Tweeten, Luther, "Rural Employment and Unemployment Statistics," in Data Collection, Processing, and Presentation: National and Local, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979, pp. 527-560.

263. Westat, Inc., Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey: Technical Report No. 1, Methodology, U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, 1977.

264. Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations, Bureau of Research and Statistics, Occupational Opportunities Information for Wisconsin, Vol. 10, No. 1, Madison, June, 1979.

265. 94th U.S. Congress, Public Law 94-482: The Education Amendments of 1976, Title Two.

266. 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, Washington, D.C., 1973.

267. 94th Congress, Public Law 4-444: Emergency Jobs Program Extension Act of 1976.

268. 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-524: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978, "Title VII: Private Sector Opportunities for the Economically Disadvantaged," 1978.

269. 93rd U.S. Congress, Public Law 93-203: Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.

270. 95th U.S. Congress, Public Law 95-93: The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, August, 1977.

271. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Detailed Characteristics: Massachusetts, PC(1)-D23, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973.

272. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Evaluation and Research Program of the U.S. Census of Population and Housing 1960: The Employer Record Check, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963.

273. U.S. Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics: Massachusetts, PC(1)-C23, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972.

274. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Money Income in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 105, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

275. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Job Openings Survey Manual, Washington, D.C., February, 1979.

276. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the Population Below the Poverty Level: 1975, Series P-60, No. 106, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

277. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *County Business Patterns, 1975: Massachusetts*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

278. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Detailed Characteristics: U.S. Summary*, PC(1)-D1, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973.

279. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty Status in 1975 of Families and Persons in the United States and the Northeast Region, by Divisions and States*, (Spring 1976 Survey of Income and Education), U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

280. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1976*, Series P-60, No. 107, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

281. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Money Income and Poverty Status in the United States and the Northeast Region*, by Division and States, Series P-60, No. 110.

282. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *1972 Census of Manufacturing*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

283. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *1972 Census of Retail Trade*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

284. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Public Use Samples of Basic Records from the 1970 Census: Description and Technical Documentation*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1972.

285. U.S. Department of Labor, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act: Compilation of Current Regulations for Title I, II and VI," *Federal Register*, October 18, 1977.

286. U.S. Department of Labor, *Employment and Training Evaluation Report-1979*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

287. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Annual Earnings and Employment Patterns of Private Nonagricultural Employees: 1973-75*, Bulletin 2031, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

288. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Annual Earnings and Employment Patterns of Private Nonagricultural Employees, 1971 and 1972*, Bulletin 1928, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

289. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *BLS Handbook of Methods*, Bulletin 1910, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

290. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Directory of Occupational Wage Surveys: January 1970-December 1977, Report 537, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

291. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, January, 1979.

292. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, March, 1979.

293. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment Projections for the 1980's, Bulletin 2030, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

294. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment: States, 1978 and Metropolitan Areas, 1977-78, Report 571, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

295. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Projections and Training Data, Bulletin 2020, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

296. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Supply: Concepts and Sources of Data for Manpower Analysis, Bulletin 1816, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.

297. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Training Information in New England: An Evaluation, Washington, D.C., 1978.

298. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Tomorrow's Manpower Needs: Supplement Number Four, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1974.

299. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Concepts and Methods Used in Labor Force Statistics Derived from the Current Population Survey, BLS Report No. 463, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

300. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Occupational Outlook, 1979 Job Vacancy-Labor Turnover Pilot Studies, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., Unpublished, August, 1978.

301. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics and Employment and Training Administration, Occupational Training in Selected Metalworking Industries: A Report on a Survey of Selected Occupations, 1974, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1976.

302. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Training Information in New England: An Evaluation, Boston, 1978.

303. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Tomorrow's Manpower Needs, Vol: IV*, (Revised), Bulletin 1737, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971.

304. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Division of Labor Market Information, *Introduction to Labor Market Information and the LMI System*, Washington, D.C., 1979.

305. U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973: Forms Preparation Handbook*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975.

306. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Amendments of 1978: Forms Preparation Handbook*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

307. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule," *Federal Register*, Vol. 44, No. 65, April 3, 1979.

308. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *Employer Information System: Draft Technical Assistance Guide*, Washington, D.C., undated.

309. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *FY 1978 Characteristics of ES Job Applicants*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

310. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *Guidelines for the Development of Labor Market Information Needed for CETA Planning Purposes*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

311. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *The Labor Market Information System of the Employment and Training Administration*, Washington, D.C., 1976.

312. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *The New Business Look in Employment and Training Programs*, Region X, ETA, Seattle, 1979.

313. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *Selected Socioeconomic Indicators from the 1976 SIE: Package No. 1*, Washington, D.C., 1979.

314. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, *Unemployment Insurance Statistics*, July-September 1978, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

315. U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, *Employment and Training Report of the President: 1979*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1980.

316. U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1978, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1979.

317. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Manpower Program Development, "The Role of Planning Councils and Community Participation in the Planning Process, CETA Staff Evaluation Findings, 1975," unpublished paper.

318. U.S. Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, "Youth Programs Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act," Federal Register, September 16, 1977, Part VI, p. 46728.

319. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, A Planning Charter for the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act of 1977, Washington, D.C., 1977.

320. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, Putting America's Future to Work, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

312. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs, Youth Initiatives, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1978.

322. U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President: 1971, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1971.

323. U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, A Custom-Made Manpower Data Report: Summary Manpower Indicators for Fall River Labor Market Area, Massachusetts, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, University of California, undated.

324. U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Manpower Report of the President: 1975, "Public Service Employment Achievements and Open Issues," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1975.

325. U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1976, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

326. U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Secretary, Interim Report of the Secretary of Labor on the Recommendations of the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1980.

327. U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Employment and Training Report of the President: 1977, "Measurement of Employment and Unemployment," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1977, pp. 29-43.

328. U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, The Neighborhood Youth Corps: A Review of the Research, Manpower Research Monograph, No. 13, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1970.

329. U.S. Employment Service, U.S. Department of Labor, ESP: Proceedings of the Employment Service Potential Meeting, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, the University of Michigan-Wayne State University, 1979.

330. U.S. General Accounting Office, Evaluation of Results and Administration of the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS) Program in Five Cities, Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., 1971.

331. U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Case Studies of the Emergency Employment Act in Operation, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1973.

332. Utah Department of Employment Security, Utilizing Occupational Hire Data, Salt Lake City, February, 1977.

333. Utter, Carol, "Improvements in the Bureau of Labor Statistics Labor Turnover Survey," ESP: Proceedings of the Employment Service Potential Meetings.

334. Vigeant, Paul, The Role of Establishment Surveys in the Policy Formulation Process, Paper presented at the CLMS-MOICC Conference on Employer Surveys, Auburn, Massachusetts, February, 1980.

335. Vinson, Robert; Sum, Andrew; and Sawhney, P.K., Available Data Sources on Enrollment, Completions and Placements from Vocational Training Programs in Proprietory Schools Licensed by the Massachusetts Department of Education, Department of Economics, Northeastern University, Boston, 1977.

336. Vinson, Robert and Ganz, Russell, "Employment and Earnings Inadequacy in Massachusetts and New England," Current Issues in Employment and Training Policy, Planning, and Evaluation, pp. 125-152.

337. Vinson, Robert and Harrington, Paul, Defining 'High Technology' Industries in Massachusetts, Policy and Evaluation Division, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, September, 1979.

338. Vinson, Robert and McKinnon, David, High Technology Employment Development Within Selected Labor Market Areas in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, Research and Program Development Division, Boston, March, 1980.

339. Vinson, Robert; Sum, Andrew; Bouba, Maryann and Ganz, Russell, Employment and Unemployment Developments in Massachusetts: An Overview of Their Level and Structure, 1971-1977, Policy and Evaluation Unit, Massachusetts Department of Manpower Development, April, 1979.

340. Virginia Employment Commission, Manpower Research Division, 1976 Wage Rates and Fringe Benefits for Selected Occupations Paid by Virginia Manufacturers, Richmond, 1976.

341. Vroman, Wayne, "Worker Upgrading and the Business Cycle," Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Vol. 1, 1977, pp. 229-257.

342. Westate, Inc., Continuous Longitudinal Manpower Survey, Follow-up Report No. 1 (18 Months After Entry), Post-Program Experience and Pre-Post Comparisons for Terminees Who Entered CETA in January-June 1975, Prepared for U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Rockville, Maryland, 1978.

343. Westat, Inc., CLMS Report No. 8: Characteristics of Enrollees Who Entered CETA Programs During Fiscal Year 1977, Prepared for U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Rockville, Maryland, 1978.

344. Wescott, Diane, N., "Youth in the Labor Force: An Area Study," Monthly Labor Review, July, 1978, pp. 3-9.

345. White, Sheila C., "Job Vacancy Survey," Employment and Earnings, September, 1970, pp. 18-26.

346. Wisniowski, Howard, An Introduction to an Employer Survey, Hampden County Manpower Consortium, Springfield, Mass., February, 1980.

347. Wolfbein, Seymour L., "'Employers' Reports on Employment, Hours, and Earnings in their Establishments," Data Collection, Processing and Presentation: National and Local, National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1980.

348. Wool, Harold, "Some Analytical Shortcomings of Occupational Data on Employed and Unemployed Workers," Concepts and Data Needs, pp. 539-568.

349. Worcester Employment and Training Consortium, Employer Survey Overview: Thirteen High Net Demand Occupations, Worcester, July, 1979.

350. Wurzburg, Gregory, "Summary of Findings and Recommendations," The Local Focus on Youth: A Review of Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (Report No. 3 in a Series), National Council on Employment Policy, Washington, D.C., March, 1979.

351. Young, Anne McDougall, Work Experience of the Population in 1976, BLS Special Labor Force Report 201, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1977.

352. Young, Anne McDougall, Work Experience of the Population in 1977, BLS Special Labor Force Report 224, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1979.

353. Zornitsky, Jeffrey, The Use of Performance Indicators for Assessing CETA Title II Programs: A Critical Examination of the Performance Review Guidelines, Paper Presented to the U.S. Department of Labor's CETA Title II Performance Measures Conference, Arlington, Virginia, February, 1980.